AGAINST THE HEAVENLY PROPHETS IN THE MATTER OF IMAGES AND SACRAMENTS

1525

Part I—Translated by Bernhard Erling

Part II—Translated by Conrad Bergendoff

INTRODUCTION

This treatise is Luther's reply to a former colleague who had disagreed with him and gone in a direction which threatened the doctrines of the Lutheran Reformation. While there is occasionally a glimpse of the former friendship between the two men, the earnestness of Luther in defending his position leads him to speak sharply of Karlstadt and his companions, "the heavenly prophets." It is, however, not a personal attack, but a thorough attempt to show how subjective and unbiblical the "spiritualists" are.

Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt was probably a couple of years older than Luther (born *ca.* 1480). After studies at Erfurt and Cologne he came to Wittenberg, where he was made a doctor in 1510. A student of Thomas Aquinas, he had at first opposed Luther, but later, through his interest in Augustine, he became his advocate, and debated against Eck at Leipzig. In 1520 he broke with the papal church, and in 1521 aided Christian II in reforming the Danish church. While Luther was at the Wartburg, Karlstadt became a leader of the movement in Wittenberg to demolish everything connected with the Roman mass, and to do away with all traditional forms, images, vestments, and the like. This provoked excesses and Luther returned to preach against the destructive mob.

Karlstadt became pastor at Orlamünde, in the neighborhood of Wittenberg, in 1523. He was not in sympathy with the revolutionary tendencies of Thomas Münzer, but he and his followers were associated in the minds of many with the mysticism and agitations of the "Allstedtians" (Münzer was pastor at Allstedt). Luther sought to win Karlstadt back at a conference in Jena, August 22, 1524. The effort was fruitless, and because of the incendiary character of his preaching Karlstadt was expelled from Saxony, in 1524. He went to southern Germany, and eventually became a professor in Basel.

At Jena Luther had challenged Karlstadt to state his views publicly and in writing, and as a token of this invitation Luther gave him a gold coin. Karlstadt accepted the challenge and began a series of treatises on the Lord's Supper. After his expulsion his tone became sharper toward

Luther. In all, eight tracts were prepared—five on the Lord's Supper, one on consideration for weak consciences, one on the nature of faith and unbelief, one in opposition to infant baptism.

Thus it was largely on the question of the sacraments that Karlstadt opposed Luther and found himself in Zwingli's camp. For a disciple of Karlstadt brought the tracts to Zurich where they were read by the Anabaptist leaders, and to Basel where they were secretly printed. Late in 1524, the tract on baptism was confiscated, and the printer imprisoned. The remaining tracts were circulated, along with a statement of Karlstadt on his expulsion, and led to Zwingli's statement on the Lord's Supper and the consequent controversy between Zwingli and Luther on this issue.

Concern was felt in Strassburg over the controversy between Luther and Karlstadt even before the appearance of the tracts. When these appeared seven Strassburg preachers, Wolfgang Capito and Martin Bucer among them, addressed a letter to Luther (November 23, 1524) asking for his counsel. Not many liked Karlstadt's manner but there was sympathy for his interpretation of the sacrament. Luther answered with a "*Letter to the Christians at Strassburg in Opposition to the Fanatic Spirit*," in December, 1524. When the printed tracts came to Luther's attention he realized how widespread the opinions of Karlstadt were, and how related they were to those of Zwingli and other antagonists. He felt the necessity of a comprehensive refutation, and began his *Against the Heavenly Prophets*. The work expanded and Luther decided to divide it into two parts. The first was ready by the end of December, 1524, the second a month later in January, 1525.

Even Melanchthon complained over the violence of Luther's style. The book only hardened the opponents in their stand, but it was probably an effective bar to the further spread of Zwinglian doctrine among Luther's own followers. Its composition also clarified in Luther's own thinking some of the fundamental doctrines with which he was struggling. The primacy of the Word of God as a basis for all doctrines caused him to repel the mysticism which underlay Karlstadt's subjective notions. He saw distinctly the role of faith and reason in the matter of authority, and foresaw that Karlstadt's ideas would end in denial of Christian faith altogether. We may regret the tone of the treatise and its blunt language, but we may not forget that the contest concerned crucial issues of the Reformation. It was not a question of Luther's or Karlstadt's opinions of each other, but a question of the unshakeable basis on which the Reformation could withstand attacks from both Rome and Zurich and thus hope to provide for future generations a firm foundation of faith.

The translation follows that of a German Wittenberg text of 1525 as given in *WA* 18:62–125, 134–214.

AGAINST THE HEAVENLY PROPHETS IN THE MATTER OF IMAGES AND SACRAMENTS

PART I

In the name of God and our dear Lord Jesus Christ. There has been a change in the weather. I had almost relaxed and thought the matter was finished; but then it suddenly arises anew and it is for me as the wise man says: "When man finishes, he must begin again" [Sirach 18:6].

Doctor Andreas Karlstadt has deserted us, and on top of that has become our worst enemy. May Christ grant that we be not alarmed, and give us his mind and courage, that we may not err and despair before the Satan who here pretends to vindicate the sacrament, but has much else in mind. For since he has not thus far been able to suppress with violence the whole doctrine of the gospel, he seeks to destroy it with cunning interpretation of Scripture.

Now I have foretold it, and my prophesying will become true (I'm afraid), that God will visit our ingratitude and permit the truth to be cast down, as Daniel says (Dan. 8:[12]). Because we persecute and do not accept the truth, we must again have vain error and false spirits and prophets. These have already been with us to some extent for three years, though thus far hindered by his grace. Otherwise they would long ago have wrought havoc in our ranks. Whether he will keep this disturbance in check any longer, I do not know, since no one cares, no one prays for it, and all are without fear, as though the devil were sleeping who, however, goes about as a furious lion [1 Pet. 5:8]. Although I hope restraint will not be lacking as long as I live. Therefore I personally, as long as I live, will resist insofar as God helps me, and help wherever possible. And this is my earnest, sincere warning and admonition:

First, that each one with complete earnestness pray God for a right understanding and for his holy, pure Word. In view of the fact that under such a mighty prince and god of this world—the devil—it is not within our power to preserve either the faith or God's Word, there must be divine power which protects it, as Psalm 12 well prays and says [Ps. 12:6–8], "The promises of the Lord are promises that are pure, purified seven times. Do thou, O Lord, protect us, guard us ever from this generation. On every side the wicked prowl, as vileness is exalted among the sons of men." If we boast that we have God's word and do not take care as to how we are to keep it, it is soon lost.

Second, we, too, ought to do our part and not close our eyes, but be on our guard. For God nonetheless always holds his grace firmly over the world, so that he permits no false prophets to attempt anything except something external, such as works and subtle minute discoveries about external things. No one concerns himself with faith and a good conscience before God, but only with what glitters and shines before reason and the world. Just as the Arians apparently put up a good case in the court of reason, when they alleged that God was only one person, the Father, while the Son and the Holy Spirit were not true God.

Likewise, it was easy and pleasant for the Jews and Pelagians to believe that works without grace made one pious; and under the papacy it was said in an attractive way that the free will also contributes something toward grace. So, since it is in accord with reason, it sounds altogether pleasant to say that there is simply bread and wine in the sacrament. Who cannot believe that? If one only today would grant to the Jews that Christ was simply a man, I think it would be easy to convert them.

So our concern here should now be that we keep these two teachings far apart from each other: the one that teaches of the main articles, to govern the conscience in the spirit before God; the other, which teaches of things external or works. For more depends on the teaching of faith and a good conscience than on the teaching of good works. When works are lacking, help and counsel are at hand so that one can produce them if the teaching of faith remains firm and

pure. But if the teaching of faith is placed in the background and works are put forward, then nothing can be good and there is neither counsel nor help. Then works lead to vain glory and seem to people to be something great, while God's glory disappears.

So it is with these honor-seeking prophets who do nothing but break images, destroy churches, manhandle the sacrament, and seek a new kind of mortification, that is, a self-chosen putting to death of the flesh. Thus far they have not set aright the conscience, which is nonetheless most important and most necessary in the Christian teaching, as has been said.

And if they had now altogether succeeded so that there were no more images, no churches remained, no one in the whole world held that the flesh and blood of Christ were in the sacrament and all went about in gray peasant garb, what would be accomplished thereby? What did they expect to achieve by pressing, straining, and pursuing this course of action? Would they therewith have become Christian? Where would faith and love be? Should they come later? Why should they not have precedence? Fame, vain glory and a new monkery would well thereby be achieved, as happens in all works, but the conscience would in no way be helped. Thus such false spirits do not care where faith or love are to be found, just as the pope does not care but presses on if only he can make sure of the works belonging to his obedience and laws. And when they do occur, still nothing has occurred.

Since Dr. Karlstadt pursues the same way and in so many books does not even teach what faith and love are (yes, they speak derisively and disdainfully of us on this account, as though it were a minor doctrine), but stresses and emphasizes external works, let everyone be warned of him. Everyone should know that he has a perverted spirit that thinks only of murdering the conscience with laws, sin, and works, so that thereby nothing is set aright, even if everything happened that he professes in all his books, and with mouth and heart. Even rascals are able to do and teach all that he urges. Therefore something higher must be there to absolve and comfort the conscience. This is the Holy Spirit, who is not acquired through breaking images or any other works, but only through the gospel and faith.

Now in order that we do not open our mouths too wide and marvel at the skill of these false spirits, and thereby abandon the main articles, and thus deceitfully be led off the track (for thereby the devil succeeds through these prophets), I will here briefly recount these articles of the Christian faith to which everyone is above all things to pay attention and hold fast.

The first is the law of God, which is to be preached so that one thereby reveals and teaches how to recognize sin (Rom. 3[:20] and 7[:7]), as we have often shown in our writings. However, these prophets do not understand this correctly, for this means a truly spiritual preaching of the law, as Paul says in Rom. 7[:14], and a right use of the law, as he says in 1 Tim. 1[:8].

Secondly, when now sin is recognized and the law is so preached that the conscience is alarmed and humbled before God's wrath, we are then to preach the comforting word of the gospel and the forgiveness of sins, so that the conscience again may be comforted and established in the grace of God, etc.

Christ himself teaches these two articles in such an order (Luke 24[:47]). One must preach repentance and the forgiveness of sins in his name. "And the Spirit (he says in John [16:8]) will convince the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment." You do not find either of these two articles in this one or any other of the false prophets. They also do not understand them, and yet these are the most important and necessary articles.

Now the third is judgment, the work of putting to death the old man, as in Romans 5; 6, and 7. Here works are concerned, and also suffering and affliction, as we through our own discipline and fasting, watching, labor, etc., or through other persecution and disgrace put to death our flesh. This putting to death is also not handled correctly by these false prophets. For they do not accept what God gives them, but what they themselves choose. They wear gray garb, would be as peasants, and carry on with similar foolish nonsense.

In the fourth place, such works of love toward the neighbor should flow forth in meekness, patience, kindness, teaching, aid, and counsel, spiritually and bodily, free and for nothing, as Christ has dealt with us.

In the fifth and last place, we ought to proclaim the law and its works, not for the Christians, but for the crude and unbelieving. For among Christians we must use the law spiritually, as is said above, to reveal sin. But among the crude masses, on Mr. Everyman, we must use it bodily and roughly, so that they know what works of the law they are to do and what works ought to be left undone. Thus they are compelled by sword and law to be outwardly pious, much in the manner in which we control wild animals with chains and pens, so that external peace will exist among the people. To this end temporal authority is ordained, which God would have us honor and fear (Rom. 13[:1]; 1 Pet. 3) [1 Pet. 2:13, 17].

However, we must see to it that we retain Christian freedom and do not force such laws and works on the Christian conscience, as if one through them were upright or a sinner. Here question are in order concerning the place which images, foods, clothing, places, persons, and all such external things, etc., ought to have. Whoever does not teach according to this order certainly does not teach correctly. From which you now see that Dr. Karlstadt and his spirits replace the highest with the lowest, the best with the least, the first with the last. Yet he would be considered the greatest spirit of all, he who has devoured the Holy Spirit feathers and all.

Therefore I beg every Christian who observes how we bicker in this matter to remember that we are not dealing with important things, but with the most trivial ones. Bear in mind that the devil is eager to spruce up such minor matters, thereby drawing the attention of the people so that the truly important matters are neglected, as long as they gape in his direction. From this each one should recognize how false and evil the spirit of Dr. Karlstadt is, who, not content to ignore and be silent concerning the great and significant articles, so inflates the least significant ones as if the salvation of the world depended more on them than on Christ himself. Also, he compels us to turn from the great important articles to minor ones, so that we with him lose time and are in danger of forgetting the main articles. Let this be the first fruit by which one is able to know this tree [Matt. 7:16–20].

So that the books, however, will not become too many, I will answer all of his with this one book. And since I have not yet written anything especially about images, this shall be the first. For while it pleases him to begin this work recklessly, he sought afterwards to mend himself and cover the shame with fig leaves.

On the Destruction of Images

I approached the task of destroying images by first tearing them out of the heart through God's Word and making them worthless and despised. This indeed took place before Dr. Karlstadt ever dreamed of destroying images. For when they are no longer in the heart, they

can do no harm when seen with the eyes. But Dr. Karlstadt, who pays no attention to matters of the heart, has reversed the order by removing them from sight and leaving them in the heart. For he does not preach faith, nor can he preach it; unfortunately, only now do I see that. Which of these two forms of destroying images is best, I will let each man judge for himself.

For where the heart is instructed that one pleases God alone through faith, and that in the matter of images nothing that is pleasing to him takes place, but is a fruitless service and effort, the people themselves willingly drop it, despise images, and have none made. But where one neglects such instruction and forces the issue, it follows that those blaspheme who do not understand and who act only because of the coercion of the law and not with a free conscience. Their idea that they can please God with works becomes a real idol and a false assurance in the heart. Such legalism results in putting away outward images while filling the heart with idols.

I say this so that every one may see the kind of a spirit that is lodged in Karlstadt. He blames me for protecting images contrary to God's Word, though he knows that I seek to tear them out of the hearts of all and want them despised and destroyed. It is only that I do not approve of his wanton violence and impetuosity. If the Holy Spirit were here, he would not lie as knowingly and unashamedly as that, but would say, "Yes, dear Luther, I am well pleased that you so utterly destroy images in the heart. Thereby it will be all the easier for me to destroy them before the eyes, and I accept your service as necessary to this end." Now I am supposed to be acting contrary to God's Word, and protecting images, I who do destroy images outwardly and inwardly. And I am not to say that he acts contrary to God's Word, he who only smashes them in pieces outwardly, while he permits idols to remain in the heart and sets up others alongside them, namely false confidence and pride in works.

Furthermore, I have allowed and not forbidden the outward removal of images, so long as this takes place without rioting and uproar and is done by the proper authorities. In the world it is considered foolish to conceal the true reason for a good venture out of fear that it may fail. However, when Karlstadt disregards my spiritual and orderly putting away of images and makes me out to be only a "protector of images," this is an example of his holy and prophetic art, though I only resisted his factious, violent, and fanatical spirit. Now since the evil spirit sits so firmly in his mind I am less inclined than ever to yield to obstinacy and wrong. I will first discuss images according to the law Of Moses, and then according to the gospel. And I say at the outset that according to the law of Moses no other images are forbidden than an image of God which one worships. A crucifix, on the other hand, or any other holy image is not forbidden. Heigh now! you breakers of images, I defy you to prove the opposite!

In proof of this I cite the first commandment (Exod. 20[:3]): "You shall have no other gods before me." Immediately, following this text, the meaning of having other gods is made plain in the words: "You shall not make yourself a graven image, or any likeness …" [Exod. 20:4]. This is said of the same gods, etc. And although these spirits cling to the little word "make" and stubbornly insist, "Make, make is something else than to worship," yet they must admit that this commandment basically speaks of nothing else than of the glory of God. It must certainly be "made" if it is to be worshiped, and unmade if it is not to be worshiped. It is not valid, however, to pick out one word and keep repeating it. One must consider the meaning of the whole text in its context. Then one sees that it speaks of images of God which are not to be worshiped. No one will be able to prove anything else. From subsequent words in the same

chapter [Exod. 20:23], “You shall not make gods of silver to be with me, nor shall you make for yourselves gods of gold,” it follows that “make” certainly refers to such gods.

For this saying, “You shall have no other gods,” is the central thought, the standard, and the end in accordance with which all the words which follow are to be interpreted, connected, and judged. For this passage points out and expresses the meaning of this commandment, namely, that there are to be no other gods. Therefore the words “make,” “images,” “serve,” etc., and whatever else follows, are to be understood in no other sense than that neither gods nor idolatry are to develop therefrom. Even as the words, “I am your God” [Exod. 20:2], are the standard and end for all that may be said about the worship and service of God. And it would be foolish if I sought to conclude from this something that had nothing to do with the divine or the service of God, such as building houses, plowing, etc. No conclusion can be drawn from the words, “You shall have no other gods,” other than that which refers to idolatry. Where however images or statues are made without idolatry, then such making of them is not forbidden, for the central saying, “You shall have no other gods,” remains intact.

If they do not want to apply “make” to images of God, as the text requires, then I will also say that worship is not forbidden (since we are clinging so strictly to the letter). For in the first commandment nothing is said about worship. I might say, “Don’t make images yourself. Let others make them. But you are not forbidden to worship them.” If they, however, from other passages connect “make” with “worship,” which is not done in this text, then in all fairness I may connect in the same text “make” with the gods, as the text clearly states. Thus we have no example of punishment being inflicted on account of images and altars, but it has followed on account of worship. We read thus that Moses’ brazen serpent remained [Num. 21:8] until Hezekiah destroyed it solely because it had been worshiped [2 Kings 18:4].

Concerning this I have a powerful passage in Lev. 26[:1], “I am the Lord your God. You shall make for yourselves no idols and erect no graven image or pillar, and you shall not set up a figured stone in your land, to bow down to them.” How is this? Here I think the interpretation is sufficiently clear. It is because of worship that idols and figured stones are forbidden. It is without doubt so that they will not be worshiped, and where they are not worshiped they might well be set up and made. What would be the need otherwise of referring to bowing down? Therefore the “making” in the first commandment must refer to worshiping and to no more. So also in Deut. 4[:15f.], where he forbids the making of images, the passage speaks clearly of worship.

We have also an example of this in the Old Testament. For Joshua (Josh. 24[:26]) set up a cairn at Shechem under an oak as a testimony, etc., even though above in Lev. 26[:1] the setting up of such cairns was as strictly forbidden as the images. However, because it was a stone of testimony, and not for worship, he did not do this against the commandment. Thereafter also Samuel (1 Sam. 7[:12]) set up a stone and called it Stone of Help. This was also forbidden, as has been said, but because no worship but only remembrance was intended, he did not sin.

However, above all this, Joshua (Josh. 22:21f.), according to which the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh built a large altar by the Jordan, so that all Israel became alarmed and with deep concern sent messengers to them, as though the altar had been set up contrary to God’s command, which indeed was forbidden at that time. But see how they excused themselves. The altar remained when they heard that it was not for worship or sacrifice, but to be a witness. If,

however, it had been incorrect to make an altar, and God's commandment had been strictly applied to making, they would have reduced the altar to ashes. Otherwise they would not have escaped sin, as they said they would. Now the making of altars is as strictly forbidden as the making of images. If one then can make and set up altars and special stones, so that God's commandment is not trespassed because worship is absent, then my image breakers must also let me keep, wear, and look at a crucifix or a Madonna, yes, even an idol's image, in full accord with the strictest Mosaic law, as long as I do not worship them, but only have them as memorials.

Now I wonder what these Jewish saints, who hold so strictly to the law of Moses and rage against images, do about the images on coins and jewelry? For I hear they have much money and jewelry. In Joachimsthal St. Joachim[12] is minted on coins. It would be my advice that one should rescue these great saints from sin, taking from them the guilders and the silver coins and goblets. For though they may be opposed to images, it is to be feared that they have not "put away all selfish desire" nor advanced in their "concentration," "adoration," and "sprinkling" to the point where they are of themselves able to cast away these treasures.[14] Human nature is probably still so weak that even the living voice from heaven is not strong enough for the task. To accomplish it, good strong apprentices are needed, who otherwise wouldn't have much to fritter away.

This breaking of images has also another weakness in that they themselves do it in a disorderly way, and do not proceed with proper authority. As when their prophets stand, crying and arousing the masses, saying: heigh, hew, rip, rend, smash, dash, stab, strike, run, throw, hit the idols in the mouth! If you see a crucifix, spit in its face, etc. This is to do away with images in a Karlstadtian manner, to make the masses mad and foolish, and secretly to accustom them to revolution. Those who rush into this thing think they are now great saints, and become proud and impudent beyond all measure. When one looks at the matter more closely, one finds it is a work of the law which has taken place without the Spirit and faith. Yet it makes for pride of heart, as though they by such works had gained a special status before God. Actually this means teaching works and the free will all over again.

We read however in Moses (Exod. 18[:20ff.]) that he appointed chiefs, magistrates, and temporal authority before he gave the law, and in many places he teaches: One is to try, judge, and punish in all cases with justice, witnesses, and in an orderly way. Otherwise, why have judges and sovereigns in the land? Karlstadt always skips over this matter altogether too easily. What Moses commands Karlstadt applies to the disorderly masses and teaches them to break into this field in disorder like pigs. This certainly is and must be called a seditious and rebellious spirit, which despises authority and itself behaves wantonly as though it were lord in the land and above the law. Where one permits the masses without authority to break images, one must also permit anyone to proceed to kill adulterers, murderers, the disobedient, etc. For God commanded the people of Israel to kill these just as much as to put away images. Oh, what sort of business and government that would turn out to be! Therefore, though I have not said that Dr. Karlstadt is a murderous prophet, yet he has a rebellious, murderous, seditious spirit in him, which, if given an opportunity, would assert itself.

For this reason we always read in the Old Testament, where images or idols were put away, that this was done not by the masses but by the authorities, just as Jacob buried the idols of his household [Gen. 35:4]. Thus Gideon pulled down the altar of Baal when he was called by God to

be a chief [Judg. 6:27]. Thus Jehu the king (not the masses) demolished Ahab's Baal [2 Kings 10:26ff.]. So did Hezekiah also with the bronze serpent [2 Kings 18:4]. Josiah did the same with the altars at Bethel [2 Kings 23:15]. From this one sees clearly, that where God tells the community to do something and speaks to the people, he does not want it done by the masses without the authorities, but through the authorities with the people. Moreover, he requires this so that the dog does not learn to eat leather on the leash, that is, lest accustomed to rebellion in connection with the images, the people also rebel against the authorities. Talk of the devil and his imps appear.

Now that we are under our princes, lords, and emperors, we must outwardly obey their laws instead of the laws of Moses. We should therefore be calm and humbly petition them to put away such images. Where they will not do so we nonetheless have God's word meanwhile, whereby they may be put out of the heart, until they are forcibly put away outwardly by those properly authorized. However, when these prophets hear this, they call it papistic and fawning before princes. That they, on the other hand, arouse the disorderly masses and make them rebellious, that is not to fawn. Thus we will not be cleared of fawning until we teach the masses to kill the princes and the lords. However, if I am a papist or one who fawns before princes, of that the pope and the princes themselves should be more honest witnesses than this lying spirit, who here speaks. For he well knows that the contrary is known to the whole world.

Let this be said about images strictly according to the law of Moses. The meaning is not that I wish to defend images, as has been sufficiently indicated. Rather murderous spirits are not to be permitted to create sins and problems of conscience where none exist, and murder souls without necessity. For although the matter of images is a minor, external thing, when one seeks to burden the conscience with sin through it, as through the law of God, it becomes the most important of all. For it destroys faith, profanes the blood of Christ, blasphemes the gospel, and sets all that Christ has won for us at nought, so that this Karlstadtian abomination is no less effective in destroying the kingdom of Christ and a good conscience, than the papacy has become with its prohibitions regarding food and marriage, and all else that was free and without sin. For eating and drinking are also minor, external things. Yet to ensnare the conscience with laws in these matters is death for the soul.

From this let every man note which of us two is the more Christian. I would release and free consciences and the souls from sin, which is a truly spiritual and evangelical pastoral function, while Karlstadt seeks to capture them with laws and burden them with sin without good cause. And yet he does this not with the law of God, but with his own conceit and mischief, so that he is not only far from the gospel, but also not even a Mosaic teacher. And yet he continually praises the "Word of God, the Word of God," just as if it were therefore to become God's Word as soon as one could say the Word of God. Usually those who make great ado in praising God's Word do not have much to back them up, as unfortunately we have previously experienced under our papistic tyrants.

However to speak evangelically of images, I say and declare that no one is obligated to break violently images even of God, but everything is free, and one does not sin if he does not break them with violence. One is obligated, however, to destroy them with the Word of God, that is, not with the law in a Karlstadtian manner, but with the gospel. This means to instruct and enlighten the conscience that it is idolatry to worship them, or to trust in them, since one is to trust alone in Christ. Beyond this let the external matters take their course. God grant that

they may be destroyed, become dilapidated, or that they remain. It is all the same and makes no difference, just as when the poison has been removed from a snake.

Now I say this to keep the conscience free from mischievous laws and fictitious sins, and not because I would defend images. Nor would I condemn those who have destroyed them, especially those who destroy divine and idolatrous images. But images for memorial and witness, such as crucifixes and images of saints, are to be tolerated. This is shown above to be the case even in the Mosaic law. And they are not only to be tolerated, but for the sake of the memorial and the witness they are praiseworthy and honorable, as the witness stones of Joshua [Josh. 24:26] and of Samuel (1 Sam. 7[:12]).

The destruction and demolishing of images at Eichen, in Grimmetal, and Birnbaum, or places to which pilgrimages are made for the adoration of images (for such are truly idolatrous images and the devil's hospices), is praiseworthy and good. However to teach that those who do not demolish them are therefore sinners is to go too far and to require more than is necessary of Christians who do enough when they fight and struggle against images with God's Word.

If you say, however: Yes, but while they remain, some will be offended by them and attracted to them, I answer: What can I do about that, I who as a Christian have no power on earth? Appoint a preacher who will instruct the people against them, or arrange to have them removed in an orderly way, not with tumult and riots.

Now then, let us get to the bottom of it all and say that these teachers of sin and Mosaic prophets are not to confuse us with Moses. We don't want to see or hear Moses. How do you like that, my dear rebels? We say further, that all such Mosaic teachers deny the gospel, banish Christ, and annul the whole New Testament. I now speak as a Christian for Christians. For Moses is given to the Jewish people alone, and does not concern us Gentiles and Christians. We have our gospel and New Testament. If they can prove from them that images must be put away, we will gladly follow them. If they, however, through Moses would make us Jews, we will not endure it.

What do you think? What will become of this? It will become evident that these factious spirits understand nothing in the Scriptures, neither Moses nor Christ, and neither seek nor find anything therein but their own dreams. And our basis for this assertion is from St. Paul (1 Tim. 1[:9]), "The law is not laid down for the just" (which a Christian is). And Peter (Acts 15[:10–11]), "Now therefore why do you make trial of God by putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear? But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, just as they will." With this saying (as Paul with his) Peter abrogates for the Christian the whole of Moses with all his laws.

Yes, you say, that is perhaps true with respect to the ceremonial and the judicial law, that is, what Moses teaches about the external order of worship or of government. But the decalogue, that is, the Ten Commandments, are not abrogated. There is nothing of ceremonial and judicial law in them. I answer: I know very well that this is an old and common distinction, but it is not an intelligent one. For out of the Ten Commandments flow and depend all the other commandments and the whole of Moses.

Because he would be God alone and have no other gods, etc., he has instituted so many different ceremonies or acts of worship. Through these he has interpreted the first commandment and taught how it is to be kept. To promote obedience to parents, and unwilling

to tolerate adultery, murder, stealing, or false witness, he has given the judicial law or external government so that such commandments will be understood and carried out.

Thus it is not true that there is no ceremonial or judicial law in the Ten Commandments. Such laws are in the decalogue, depend on it, and belong there. And to indicate this God himself has expressly introduced two ceremonial laws, namely, concerning images and the sabbath. We can show that these two parts are ceremonial laws which are also each in its way abrogated in the New Testament, so that one may see how Dr. Karlstadt deals about as wisely in his book with the sabbath as with images. For St. Paul (Col. 2[:16–17]), speaks frankly and clearly, "Therefore let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a sabbath. These are only a shadow of what is to come." Here Paul expressly abrogates the sabbath and calls it a shadow now past since the body, which is Christ himself, is come.

Also, Gal. 4[:10–11], "You observe days, and months, and seasons, and years! I am afraid I have labored over you in vain." Here Paul calls it lost labor to observe days and seasons, among which is also the sabbath. Isaiah has also prophesied this (Isa. 66[:23]), "From new moon to new moon, and from sabbath to sabbath," that is, there shall be a daily sabbath in the New Testament, with no difference as to time.

We must be grateful to Paul and Isaiah, that they so long ago freed us from the factious spirits. Otherwise we should have to sit through the sabbath day with "head in hand" awaiting the heavenly voice, as they would delude us. Yes, if Karlstadt were to write more about the sabbath, even Sunday would have to give way, and the sabbath, that is, Saturday, would be celebrated. He would truly make us Jews in all things, so that we also would have to be circumcised, etc.

For it is true, and no one can deny it, that whoever keeps the law of Moses as a law of Moses, or deems it necessary to keep it, must regard the keeping of all laws as necessary, as St. Paul (Gal. 5[:3]) concludes and says, "Every man who receives circumcision—he is bound to keep the whole law." Therefore also, whoever destroys images, or observes the sabbath (that is, whoever teaches that it must be kept), he also must let himself be circumcised and keep the whole Mosaic law. In time (where one leaves room for these spirits) they would surely be compelled to do, teach, and observe this. However, by God's grace they now do even as St. Paul says (Gal. 6[:13]), "For even those who receive circumcision do not themselves keep the law, but they desire to have you circumcised that they may glory in your flesh." Thus the image breakers themselves do not keep the law. For just as they fail to keep all the other laws, so also they destroy images unspiritually, as a work, so that they lose Christ, the fulfilment of the law, and seek only that they may attain a glory in us, as if they had taught something excellent and masterful.

The reference to images in the first commandment is also a temporal ceremony. St. Paul concludes and says among other things (1 Cor. 7 [1 Cor. 8:4]): "We know that 'an idol has no real existence.' " Just as he says of circumcision (1 Cor. 7[:19]), "Circumcision is nothing," that is, it is a matter of freedom and does not bind the conscience, just as he himself throughout that section speaks of freedom. However, let St. Paul and all the angels be defied, in that they call something nothing or a matter of freedom, which God so strictly commands. So the fanatics allege. But one is not to consider God's commandment as useless or as nothing, as Moses says in Deuteronomy, for it does concern life.

He points out especially that “an idol is nothing in the world” [1 Cor. 8:4] in relation to external matters. In relation to God idols are no joke. Such idols in the heart are false righteousness, glory in works, unbelief, and anything else that takes the place of Christ in the heart in the form of unbelief. As if he were to say, the Jews avoid the external idols in the world, but before God their hearts are full of idols. He also says of them (Rom. 2[:22]), “You who abhor idols, do you rob temples?” With these words he interprets in fine fashion the first commandment, which states: “You shall have no other gods before me” [Exod. 20:3], as if saying, “In relation to yourself or the world idols are nothing, but in relation to me, that is, in the heart, you may not worship or trust in them.”

Since St. Paul declares that in all these three points the Corinthians have freedom, and would have these regarded as nothing, namely, idols, idol’s temples and food offered to idols, all three of which are strictly prohibited in the first commandment and those following from it, it is indeed clear and proven forcefully enough that the reference to images in the first commandment is to a temporal ceremony, which has been abrogated in the New Testament. For just as I may with good conscience eat and drink that which has been offered to idols, and sit and dwell in an idol’s temple [1 Cor. 8:7–10], as St. Paul teaches, so I may also put up with idols and let them be, as things which neither make any difference nor hinder my conscience and faith.

Not only a teaching of St. Paul, the prophet Elisha (2 Kings 5[:18–19]) has also proven its truth with an admirable example in the Old Testament. According to Moses and also against Moses (as our rebellious spirits would understand Moses) he permitted Naaman, the Syrian commander, to worship the true God in the temple of Rimmon, the idol of Syria. Now if the first commandment were to be kept with Karlstadtian strictness, Naaman should not have done such a thing, nor should the prophet have permitted it. For it is, of course, strictly forbidden to go into an idol’s temple and worship before an idol while at the same time worshiping the true God. God strictly forbids the Jews to construct altars, images, or holy places for the purpose of serving and worshiping him without his command. Even more strictly does he forbid them to serve and worship him in the presence of other gods. From this example one can see again that in the Old Testament also, true idols can do no harm as long as one worships while they are around, and only the true God is worshiped from the heart. Yet our enthusiasts would ensnare us who are free Christians and tie us down so rigidly that we should not be able to put up with any idols without committing sin.

If, however, these destroyers of images will not show us any mercy, we beg them at least to be merciful to our Lord Jesus Christ and not to spit on him and say, as they do to us, “Phooey on you, you servant of idols!” For the three evangelists, Matthew [22:19ff.], Mark [12:15ff.], and Luke [20:24ff.] write that he took a coin from the Pharisees upon which was a likeness of Caesar, and asked whose likeness it was and said it should be given to Caesar. If all kinds of images had been forbidden, the Jews should not have given any to him, nor possessed any, much less should Christ have accepted it and allowed this to be unrebuked, especially since it was the image of a heathen. He must also have sinned when, according to Matt. 17[:27], he asked Peter to take a tax shekel out of the fish’s mouth and pay the tax for him. For he must have had to create the same image and the shekel in that very place and placed it in the fish’s mouth. I presume also that the gold which the three holy kings offered to Christ [Matt. 2:11] was also coined with images, as is the custom in all lands. The same thing is true of the two

hundred denarii (John 6[:17]) with which the disciples wanted to buy bread. Yes, also all the fathers and the saints are guilty insofar as they have used money.

Now we do not request more than that one permit us to regard a crucifix or a saint's image as a witness, for remembrance, as a sign as that image of Caesar was. Should it not be as possible for us without sin to have a crucifix or an image of Mary, as it was for the Jews and Christ himself to have an image of Caesar who, pagan and now dead, belonged to the devil? Indeed the Caesar had coined his image to glorify himself. However, we seek neither to receive nor give honor in this matter, and are yet so strongly condemned, while Christ's possession of such an abominable and shameful image remains uncondemned.

Would you here say, "You don't mean that the first commandment has been abrogated, for, after all, one ought to have a God? Furthermore, one ought not commit adultery, kill, steal?" Answer: I have spoken of the Mosaic law as laws of Moses. For to have a God is not alone a Mosaic law, but also a natural law, as St. Paul says (Rom. 1[:20]), that the heathen know of the deity, that there is a God. This is also evidenced by the fact that they have set up gods and arranged forms of divine service, which would have been impossible if they had neither known or thought about God. For God has shown it to them in the things that have been made, etc. (Rom. 1[:19–20]). Is it therefore surprising to find that the heathen have missed the true God and worshiped idols in the place of God? The Jews also erred and worshiped idols instead of God, even though they had the law of Moses. And they who have the gospel of Christ still misapprehend the Lord Christ.

Thus, "Thou shalt not kill, commit adultery, steal, etc.," are not Mosaic laws only, but also the natural law written in each man's heart, as St. Paul teaches (Rom. 2[:15]). Also Christ himself (Matt. 7[:12]) includes all of the law and the prophets in this natural law, "So whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." Paul does the same thing in Rom. 13[:9], where he sums up all the commandments of Moses in the love which also the natural law teaches in the words, "Love your neighbor as yourself." Otherwise, were it not naturally written in the heart, one would have to teach and preach the law for a long time before it became the concern of conscience. The heart must also find and feel the law in itself. Otherwise it would become a matter of conscience for no one. However, the devil so blinds and possesses hearts, that they do not always feel this law. Therefore one must preach the law and impress it on the minds of people till God assists and enlightens them, so that they feel in their hearts what the Word says.

Where then the Mosaic law and the natural law are one, there the law remains and is not abrogated externally, but only through faith spiritually, which is nothing else than the fulfilling of the law (Rom. 3[:31]). This is not the place to speak about that, and elsewhere enough has been said about it. Therefore Moses' legislation about images and the sabbath, and what else goes beyond the natural law, since it is not supported by the natural law, is free, null and void, and is specifically given to the Jewish people alone. It is as when an emperor or a king makes special laws and ordinances in his territory, as the *Sachsenspiegel* in Saxony, and yet common natural laws such as to honor parents, not to kill, not to commit adultery, to serve God, etc., prevail and remain in all lands. Therefore one is to let Moses be the *Sachsenspiegel* of the Jews and not to confuse us gentiles with it, just as the *Sachsenspiegel* is not observed in France, though the natural law there is in agreement with it.

Why does one then keep and teach the Ten Commandments? Answer: Because the natural laws were never so orderly and well written as by Moses. Therefore it is reasonable to follow the example of Moses. And I wish that we would accept even more of Moses in worldly matters, such as the laws about the bill of divorce [Deut. 24:1], the sabbath year [Lev. 25:2–7], the year of jubilee, tithes, and the like. Through such laws the world would be better governed than now with its practices in usury, trade, and marriage. This occurs whenever a land follows examples from laws of other lands, as the Romans took the Twelve Tables from the Greeks.[22]

It is not necessary to observe the sabbath or Sunday because of Moses' commandment. Nature also shows and teaches that one must now and then rest a day, so that man and beast may be refreshed. This natural reason Moses also recognized in his sabbath law, for he places the sabbath under man, as also Christ does (Matt. 12[:1ff.] and Mark 3[:2ff.]). For where it is kept for the sake of rest alone, it is clear that he who does not need rest may break the sabbath and rest on some other day, as nature allows. The sabbath is also to be kept for the purpose of preaching and hearing the Word of God.

There are, besides this, much better things in Moses, namely the prophecy and promise of the coming of Christ, as St. Paul says (Rom. 3[:21]). Also, Moses tells us about the creation of the world, the origin of marriage, and many precious examples of faith, love, and all virtues. In the writings of Moses we also find examples of unbelief and vice, from which one can learn to know God's grace and wrath. All are written not only for the sake of the Jews, but for the gentiles as well. Much in these writings speaks of unbelievers and gentiles, so that all such parts serve as examples to teach the whole world. However, the law of Moses concerns only the Jews, and such gentiles as have willingly submitted to it and accepted it. They are called proselytes. So St. Paul says in Rom. 9[:4] that the Jews have been given the law, the covenant, and the promise. Psalm 147[:19–20] says, "He declares his word to Jacob, his statutes and ordinances to Israel. He has not dealt thus with any other nation; they do not know his ordinances," etc.

I have myself seen and heard the iconoclasts read out of my German Bible. I know that they have it and read out of it, as one can easily determine from the words they use. Now there are a great many pictures in those books, both of God, the angels, men and animals, especially in the Revelation of John and in Moses and Joshua. So now we would kindly beg them to permit us to do what they themselves do. Pictures contained in these books we would paint on walls for the sake of remembrance and better understanding, since they do no more harm on walls than in books. It is to be sure better to paint pictures on walls of how God created the world, how Noah built the ark, and whatever other good stories there may be, than to paint shameless worldly things. Yes, would to God that I could persuade the rich and the mighty that they would permit the whole Bible to be painted on houses, on the inside and outside, so that all can see it. That would be a Christian work.

Of this I am certain, that God desires to have his works heard and read, especially the passion of our Lord. But it is impossible for me to hear and bear it in mind without forming mental images of it in my heart. For whether I will or not, when I hear of Christ, an image of a man hanging on a cross takes form in my heart, just as the reflection of my face naturally appears in the water when I look into it. If it is not a sin but good to have the image of Christ in my heart, why should it be a sin to have it in my eyes? This is especially true since the heart is

more important than the eyes, and should be less stained by sin because it is the true abode and dwelling place of God.

However, I must cease lest I hereby give occasion to the image-breakers never to read the Bible, or to burn it, and after that to tear the heart out of the body, because they are so opposed to images. I only referred to the use of the Bible to show what happens when reason wants to be wise and gain the upper hand in understanding God's Word and works. Also I wanted to show what lies behind Dr. Karlstadt's brash boast that he has God's Word and must suffer so much on its account. Indeed, the devil, too, must suffer on account of it—not that he uses it rightly, but rather perverts it and thereby increases his wickedness and lies, as Dr. Karlstadt also does due to the same vexation.

And if I had time, I would like to satisfy my desire against Satan and before the whole world stuff down his throat again the saying which he wrings out of the Scripture in such nonsensical fashion in Karlstadt's little book, so that he would have to be ashamed. For I have really caught Karlstadt at so vulnerable a point, it seems like a miracle of God to me that he can make a fool of the devil. However, I have other things to do. Whoever will not be instructed by this argument, let him go and break images his whole life long! I cannot be blamed.

In conclusion I must give an example of what I am saying to see whether Dr. Karlstadt might learn a bit himself and be ashamed that he teaches his disciples so well. When I was in Orlamünde and discussed images with the good people there, and showed from the text that all the sayings from Moses that were brought forward dealt with idolatrous images which one worshiped, a man stepped forward who wanted to be the most wise among them and said to me, "Do you hear? I would like to address you as 'you.' Are you a Christian?" I said, "Address me as you will." He would just as soon have struck me. He was so full of Karlstadt's spirit that the others could not make him keep silent. So he continued and said, "If you will not follow Moses, you must nevertheless endure the gospel. You have shoved the gospel under the bench. No, no! It must come forth and not remain under the bench."

I said, "What then does the gospel say?" He said, "Jesus says in the gospel (I don't know where, though my brethren know it) that the bride must take off her nightgown and be naked, if she is to sleep with the bridegroom. Therefore one must break all the images, so that we are free and cleansed of what is created." So far the words of our conversation.

What was I to do? I had come among Karlstadt's followers and then I learned that breaking images meant that a bride should take off her nightgown, and that this was to be found in the gospel. Such words, and words about shoving the gospel under the bench, he had heard from his master. Perhaps Karlstadt had blamed me with hiding the gospel under the bench, while he was the man who was to draw it forth. Such idle pride had brought the man into all misfortune, and had pushed him out of the light into such darkness, that he gave as a reason for breaking images, that a bride should take off her nightgown. Just as if they thereby were rid of created things in the heart, in that they madly destroy images. What though, if the bride and bridegroom were so chaste that they kept nightgown and robe on? It would certainly not hinder them much if they otherwise had desire for each other.

But so it goes, when one brings the disorderly masses into the picture. Due to great fulness of the spirit they forget civil discipline and manners, and no longer fear and respect anyone but themselves alone. This appeals to Dr. Karlstadt. These are all pretty preliminaries to riot and rebellion, so that one fears neither order nor authority. Let this be enough about images. I think

it has been adequately proven that Dr. Karlstadt does not understand Moses at all. He peddles his own dreams as the Word of God and thinks less of orderly authority than he does of the disorderly masses. Whether this be conducive to obedience or to rebellion, I leave to each one to determine for himself.

With Respect to the Complaint of Dr. Karlstadt, That He Has Been Expelled from Saxony

Thus far we have seen what kind of a Word of God Dr. Karlstadt has, for the sake of which he exalts himself and makes himself a holy martyr. Now let us see the work of God, for the sake of which, as he boasts, he suffers such great persecution. Although I would rather that he had kept silent and not compelled me to deal with his aversion. However, since he has also attacked the princes of Saxony, in that he has not even refrained from inveighing against the motto which they in all honor wear upon their sleeves, (so meanly does the bitter resentment in his heart seek occasion to bring infamy on people), I must, insofar as I have knowledge of the matter, defend the honor of my gracious lords. For the princes of Saxony have certainly deserved better of Dr. Karlstadt than that he should leave with such thanks, as he well knows. Well now, on with it and we shall see.

First, may I say this, that I have had no dealings with the elector of Saxony about Karlstadt. For that matter I have in my whole life never spoken one word with this prince, nor heard him speak, nor have I even seen his face, except once in Worms before the emperor [April 18, 1521] when I was being examined for the second time. It is to be sure true that I have often communicated with him in writing through Master Spalatin and especially insisted that the Allstedtian spirit be suppressed. However I accomplished nothing, so that I was also much annoyed with the elector, until this spirit voluntarily fled, unexpelled. For this reason Karlstadt should rightly have spared such princes and become better acquainted with the matter before he cried out to the world in his slanderous booklet.[27] Also it is not right, much less Christian, even if it were true that he was driven out by the elector, to gain revenge in this way with libel. One should first humbly have asked the reason and set forth what was right, and thereafter suffered in silence. It could not be expected of me, who am made out to be simply flesh, which unfortunately I also am. But the high spirit of Karlstadt cannot do wrong nor err. He is the right itself.

I have spoken about it with my young lord, Duke John Frederick (that I admit) and pointed out Dr. Karlstadt's wantonness and arrogance. However since "the spirit" burns with such blinding intensity, I will here recount the reasons, some of which, indeed, are not known to the princes of Saxony, why I am happy that Dr. Karlstadt is out of the country. And insofar as my entreaties are effectual, he shall not again return, and would again have to leave were he to be found here, unless he become another Andrew,[30] which God grant. If God wills, I will fawn before no princes. But much less will I suffer that the rebellious and the disobedient among the masses are to be led to despise temporal authority.

And my humble admonition and request to all princes, lords, and authorities is first, as I previously have also written against the Allstedtian spirit, that they will assiduously see to it that preachers who do not teach peacefully, but attract to themselves the mobs and on their own responsibility wantonly break images and destroy churches behind the backs of the

authorities, forthwith be exiled. Or they should deal with them so that they refrain from such action. Not that I thereby would hinder God's Word, but I would put a limit and bounds to the wantonness of mischievous enthusiasts and factious spirits, which the temporal authority is obligated to do. Above all, however, Dr. Karlstadt with his gang must be stopped, for he is obdurate and will not be instructed, but goes on justifying and defending his factiousness.

And this is my basis and reason: We have noted above how Dr. Karlstadt and image-breakers of his kind do not interpret Moses' commandment as referring to the constituted authority, as is proper, but to the disorderly populace. That is certainly not the right spirit and attitude. For, as I have said, where the populace has the right and power to carry out a divine commandment, then one must thereafter give in and permit them to carry out all the commandments. Consequently, whoever arrives on the scene first must put to death murderers, adulterers, thieves, and punish rogues. And thereby justice, jurisdiction, dominion, and all authority would fall apart. Matters would take their course in accordance with the proverb: Give a rogue an inch and he takes a mile. For why do we have sovereigns? Why do they carry the sword, if the masses are to rush in blindly and straighten things out themselves?

After that, such disorder will gain in momentum, and the masses will have to kill all of the wicked. For Moses, when he commands the people to destroy images (Deut. 7[:16]), also commands them to destroy without mercy those who had such images in the land of Canaan. For this killing is just as strictly commanded as the destruction of images, which commandment these factious spirits so obstinately introduce and emphasize. Moses, however, commanded this of a people that had Joshua as chief and many magistrates and, besides, was a law-abiding people. Moreover the commandment did not apply to all of the wicked, but only to the heathen Canaanites, who through God's judgment were given over to death because of their wickedness, as the text clearly indicates. For he exempted the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites, though they also were wicked. Thus this work of God took place through regular governmental authority, and affected those whom God himself, not men, had publicly judged and condemned to death.

Since our murderous spirits apply Moses' commandment to the masses, and do not have God's judgment over the wicked, but themselves judge that those who have images are wicked and worthy of death, they will be compelled by such a commandment to engage in rebellion, in murdering and killing, as works which God has commanded them to do. Let the Allstedtian spirit be an example, who already had progressed from images to people, and who publicly called for rebellion and murder contrary to all authority. How could he act otherwise? For so he must teach. Since he had invited the devil to be his sponsor up to this point so that the masses without due process were to destroy images, as enjoined by God's commandment, then he had to continue and press the auxiliary commandment, which follows from it, and commands the people to murder. If I were to destroy images in the same sense as they, I, too, would be compelled to follow through and command people to be murdered. For the commandment stands there pressing its claim. Dear lords, the devil does not care about image breaking. He only wants to get his foot in the door so that he can cause shedding of blood and murder in the world.

But, you say, Dr. Karlstadt does not want to kill. That one can see from the letters which those of Orlamünde wrote to the Allstedtians. Answer: I also believed it! But I believe it no longer. I no longer ask what Dr. Karlstadt says or does. He has not hit the truth for the first time.

Of the spirit which they have and which impels them, I say that it is not good and is bent on murder and rebellion. Although he bows and scrapes because he sees that he is in a tight spot, I shall clearly show that what I have said is so. God forbid, but suppose Dr. Karlstadt won a large following, which he thought he could assemble on the Saale,[35] and the German Bible alone was read, and Mr. Everybody began to hold this commandment (about killing the wicked) under his own nose, in what direction would Dr. Karlstadt go? How would he control the situation? Even if he had never intended to consent to something like that, he would have to follow through. The crowds would mutiny and cry and shout as obstinately, "God's Word, God's Word, God's Word is there. We must do it!" As he now cries against images, "God's Word, God's Word!" My dear lords, Mr. Everybody is not to be toyed with. Therefore God would have authorities so that there might be order in the world.

If it were really true, and I could believe, that Dr. Karlstadt does not intend murder or rebellion, I would still have to say that he has a rebellious and murderous spirit, like the one at Allstedt, as long as he continues with wanton image breaking and draws the unruly rabble to himself. I well see that he neither strikes nor stabs, but since he carries the murderous weapon and does not put it aside, I do not trust him. He could be waiting for time and place, and then do what I fear. By the murderous weapon I mean the false interpretation and understanding of the law of Moses. Through it the devil comes and the masses are aroused to boldness and arrogance.

You say, however, Oh, he won't be that obstinate. He is willing to be instructed and desist from such things. Who? Dr. Karlstadt? To be sure, he can say the words very well, and blare forth in writings that he wants to be instructed and would listen to a superior. If he's in earnest, I'm happy. But when has he ever yielded or listened? How often has not Philip [Melanchthon] admonished him at Wittenberg that he should not rave so about Moses, images, the mass, and confession? And when I came back and preached[37] against his image breaking and celebration of the mass, why did he not then desist and listen? Also, when Dr. Justus Jonas and Master Dietrich of Bila mediated between us, how politely did he yield and permit himself to be instructed? He even summoned the Last Judgment upon me on account of the fanatic mass, which he at that time (Heaven help me!) as if with the great Holy Spirit had arranged, yet which he now himself condemns and changes.

Also, at Jena in the inn, when we talked of the matter, and he sought to defend his cause most strongly, he turned to me, snapped his fingers and said, "You are nothing to me." If he doesn't respect me, whom among us will he then respect? Or why should I then continue to admonish? I think he nevertheless considers me one of the most learned at Wittenberg. And yet he tells me to my face that I am nothing to him, and then pretends that he seeks to be instructed.

Also, he freely writes back and forth across the land and considers us at poor Wittenberg as nothing at all compared to him. And now most recently we are called papists and cousins of the Antichrist. Also, at Orlamünde, when Master Wolfgang Stein, the court preacher, bade Dr. Karlstadt most kindly and gently to yield, he screwed up his mouth and gave him such an answer as though he were prince in the land. Yet Master Wolfgang was there as a representative of the prince, whom he should have obeyed as soon as he was asked. This is the way he thinks one is to honor authority, indeed as if it were the rabble. Many more are the tricks of his nimble mind.

This I am recounting in order to show that Dr. Karlstadt's offer to be instructed is pure falsehood. Thereby he would only use forbearance and a good appearance as a smoke screen for his obdurate mind, and so dishonor both princes and myself. Also it is not proper to preach and teach in divine things and then immediately thereafter want to ask whether it is right. Then either the teaching must be wrong or the question hypocritical. But if he is really in earnest, well then, let him desist from his fanaticism. I have previously dealt quite extensively with the matter of images, so that he may understand how he is in error. Let him be instructed and separate himself from the heavenly prophets. All will simply be forgotten and I will do for him and grant him all that I am able. I will gladly have him as friend if he will. If he will not, then I must leave it in God's hands.[42]

In much the same manner he has offered to dispute but complains he has not been permitted to do so. Dear God, how can a man so publicly speak against his conscience! Should he have been refused permission to dispute by me or anyone else? Yet both princes and the university, with so much writing and issuing of summons, have not been able to get him to come back to Wittenberg, where he should attend to his preaching, lectures, and disputations, as he was obligated and bound to do. He added the stipulation that he must have safe conduct. Just as if he would be insecure at Wittenberg, where he held office and position, and where he was welcome. Who would hurt him? These are nothing but empty words to put up a good front. It may be that his conscience had made him afraid, as the wicked are wont to be afraid where there is no cause for fear, in that he at Orlamünde had fallen upon and seized what was the prerogative and right of the reigning prince. That, too, was not necessary.

If I were a prince, and paid a salary to a professor to lecture and to preach in my city or territory, and he without my knowledge and consent went elsewhere and wantonly took possession of what was rightfully due me and I meanwhile ordered him officially and through the university to resume his duties, but he, nevertheless, did what he pleased on my salary and my property, and later wrote me a letter and asked for safe conduct to dispute in my city, whereto I had already ordered him and he was obligated to come, what should I answer, since he so completely took me for a fool? And if I now did not answer, and he subsequently circulated an insulting letter against me, as though I had not been willing to permit him to dispute or be heard, what should I think? I would secretly think: He is a rascal. Not that I thereby call Dr. Karlstadt a rascal. But I indicate what in such a case might occur to a reigning prince as an individual.

However this man lacked nothing except that his princes were too indulgent. One could well have found princes, who, had he undertaken such tricks in their territories with such mischief and arrogance would have put him and his gang to the sword, and probably that would not have been just. Therefore I would advise Dr. Karlstadt not to insult the princes and to thank them that they have so graciously let him off, so that they be not compelled at last to deal with him more severely according to his merits.

Nor is this the least of all reasons why he trails along with the heavenly prophets from which, as is known, comes the Allstedtian spirit. From them he learns, to them he cleaves. They secretly smuggle error into the land and gather stealthily on the Saale, where they plan to nest. The feeble devil will go nowhere but to our place, where already through the gospel we have created opportunity and security, and seeks only to defile and destroy our nest, as the cuckoo does with the hedge sparrow. These same prophets claim that they speak with God, and God

with them, and are called to preach, and yet none of them dares come forth and appear openly, but they lay their eggs secretly and pour their poison into Dr. Karlstadt. He then promotes it with tongue and pen. But when he could not do this at Wittenberg, he began on the Saale.

These prophets teach and hold also that they are going to reform Christendom and establish it anew in this manner. They must slaughter all princes and the wicked, so that they become lords on earth and live only among saints. Such and much else I myself have heard from them. Dr. Karlstadt knows also that these are fanatics and murderous spirits and that such calamity has originated with them, which should be warning enough. Yet he does not avoid them. And I am to believe that he would not bring about murder and rebellion? Also when I reproached him about this in Jena, he himself admitted it and moreover defended it, saying, why should he not hold to them in that which they say rightly? Why then does he not also hold to us or to the papists, where we are in the right. Or is nothing right with us, or with the papists? No, against these prophets he can neither preach nor write, but against us there must be preaching, writing, and raging.

Supposing there were in Dr. Karlstadt such a spirit and he were an honorable man by ordinary standards, if he found such people in his prince's territory, he should be the first to shun them and separate himself from them and bluntly renounce them, that they desist from such prophesying, otherwise he would have to write against them, as I have done against the Allstedtian spirit. For since they are prepared and bent upon slaughter and murder, they can come from nowhere else than from the devil himself, even though they knew all arts and letters. For the devil also well knows the Bible and letters together with other arts.

Isn't it annoying that the masses now and again are made so arrogant and restless by such spirits, before it becomes known to the princes, so that as soon as they hear a preacher who teaches them to be peaceful and obedient to government, they immediately call him a toad eater and a fawner before princes and point their fingers at him? Who, however, says: "Strike dead, give no one anything, and be free Christians, you are the true people, etc.," he is a true evangelical preacher. These take the nightgown off the bride at Orlamünde[48] and the trousers off the bridegroom at Naschhausen. They do not hide the gospel under the bench, and yet they teach not at all who Christ is, or what should be known about him.

If then a prince found Dr. Karlstadt of such a kind that he held to the factious and murderous spirits, thereby making the subjects arrogant and restless, and if he furthermore sought to justify and defend himself, would it not be time that the prince said to him: "If you're the trouble maker, get out of here before I have to speak to you in some other way?" For what good can be expected when such prophets remain in the land, in which the seed already shows itself so powerful? He dare not here object that he has not been admonished before this, and that he has not known, that there has been no love for him. Who could admonish, when they deal so secretly, until they have spread the poison all around so that no one could know what they were doing. Have they not been admonished sufficiently and publicly through my writing against the Allstedt spirit? How graciously have they allowed themselves to be instructed? Also, have they not known that I have judged the spirit of these prophets as the devil's spirit? How has it helped, other than that they are more hardened than ever, with secret cunning have planned to resist me?

Yes, why have they themselves shown so little love, and so busily worked against us behind our backs in their hiding place, written against us in several territories, and in the pulpit pulled no one to pieces but the Wittenbergers, and yet they have thus far not shown us our error? Wittenberg has done it, on that the spirit feasts. Otherwise all's well in the world. And this is done under the protection of our princes, yes, under our name and sponsorship. But take care, you evil and wrathful spirits. It is still true that Wittenberg is too big a bite for you, and God may ordain that in swallowing you may choke to death on it. We know Satan, and if sometimes we doze off as men, it will do you no good, for he does not slumber nor sleep, who protects and watches over us [Ps. 121:4]. We commit ourselves to him.

Dr. Karlstadt has brought this trouble and misfortune upon himself, in my opinion, inasmuch as he carries on his enterprise without call while wilfully leaving his own calling. For he has forced himself upon Orlamünde as a wolf. For this reason it was impossible for him to do any good there. He was appointed to Wittenberg on a royally endowed income, as an archdeacon, to preach God's Word, lecture and dispute.[52] God had sent him there, and he agreed to discharge his responsibilities. He did serve for a time, usefully and with honor, and was liked and cherished. He cannot say it was otherwise. He received more advancement from the elector than many others, until the murderous prophets came and made the man wild and restless, so that he wanted to learn something better and more unusual than God teaches in the Bible.

Then he wantonly left and went to Orlamünde, without the knowledge and consent of either the prince or the university. He drove out the pastor who by order of the prince and university privilege was placed there, and personally took over the parish. What do you think of a stunt like that? Does it contribute to quiet obedience to authority, or to insolent rebellion among the masses? The spirit of which I speak peered forth, for the very same spirit which swallows such a little strap would also very likely venture to devour a whole harness, when opportunity came. He who is so venturesome that he dares in full view of a reigning prince greedily and wantonly to arrogate his property, jurisdiction, and statutes, what would he do behind the back of a prince, if he found occasion? This is the way to honor and fear the authorities and to teach the masses both with word and example that the priest is like the people, as Isaiah says [Isa. 24:2].

Even if the devil bursts, he will be unable to deny that the princes of Saxony sit as governing authorities ordained by God. The land and the people are subject to them. What kind of a spirit then is this that despises such a divine order, proceeds with headstrong violence, treats princely possessions and rights as though they were his own, and doesn't even once recognize the prince or confer with him about it, as though he were a blockhead, and he himself were prince in the land? Should not a good spirit fear God's order a little more, and since the estate, the pastorate, and the land belong to the prince, first humbly beg permission to leave and resign one position, and beg the favor of being installed in another?

Now, however, Dr. Karlstadt forsakes his duties at Wittenberg behind the prince's back, robs the university of his preaching and lectures and what he is obligated to do by reason of the prince's endowment, and retains nevertheless the salary or revenue for himself, and puts no one else in his place. At Orlamünde he also takes the pastorate belonging to the university, drives out him whom he had not appointed, nor had the power to appoint, much less to dismiss. Dear friends, why all this? Some suppose in order that he might draw that much more

income, and because he believed the elector would be lenient and not quick to punish. But I believe that a secondary reason was that the prophets sought a hide-out on the Saale, where they could spread their spirit and poison, creeping around in the darkness like mice—something they would not be able to do for long in Wittenberg.

He cannot pretend that he could not remain in Wittenberg on account of heresy, for, thank God, the gospel itself is there, pure and fine. And if it were not, he would not for that reason be driven to godless behavior. Even if the devil and his members are around us in the world, we dare not on that account be devils or members of the devil. Dr. Karlstadt was unusually free to devote himself alone to God's Word, letting the other priests do what they would. And even if there had been nothing but devils in Wittenberg, he should nevertheless not therefore, behind the prince's back, move without leave or permission, meanwhile retaining his income, and shamelessly appropriating the prince's possessions at another place.

Nor can he say that he moved out of pity for Orlamünde, to teach the erring sheep. For this pastorate was served through the university by a Christian pastor, namely Master Konrad [Glitzsch] who correctly understood and taught the gospel. And even if it had been so, he should nevertheless have petitioned the authorities about it. For one is not to do evil for the sake of the good (Rom. 3[:8]). It has been done only to give room and place for the evil spirit to circulate its poison, as I have said, so that we might be pictured as remarkable masters, with no one equal to us.

If he did not seek to gain money or to concentrate his poison, but sought only the glory of God, why did he not request to preach God's Word at other cities, where he would not have found such income? Yet the preaching might well have been needed and the cities could have been closer. Indeed it was because it wasn't convenient for the spirit and the belly. However if such mischief is to occur "out of the inner call of God," then it is necessary that it be proved with miraculous signs. For God does not change his old order for a new one unless the change is accompanied with great signs. Therefore one can believe no one who relies on his own spirit and inner feelings for authority and who outwardly storms against God's accustomed order, unless he therewith performs miraculous signs, as Moses indicates in Deut. 18[:22].

When, however, he alleges, together with the Orlamünders, that he has been elected by them as their minister, and thus externally called, I answer: To me it doesn't matter that they afterward have elected him. I speak about his first coming. Let him produce letters to show that they at Orlamünde have summoned him from Wittenberg and that he did not himself run over there. Dear friends, if being called means that I, out of a sense of duty and obedience, run to another city, and thereafter place myself in so favorable a light and persuade the people to choose me and oust another, then I say that no principality is so great, but that I would be prince therein and drive out the incumbent. How easy is it not to persuade a people? That is not the way to extend a call. It is to promote faction and rebellion and to despise authority.

Nor did the Orlamünders have a right to elect a pastor on another's salary, for it belonged to the prince and his jurisdiction. Nor is the prince or the university un-Christian, burdening them with wicked pastors. And even if he had appointed a godless one to Orlamünde, which he had not done, they should nevertheless not deprive their sovereign of his right, possession, and authority, and behind his back elect a pastor and give away revenues (which were not their own) to whomever they would. Much less should he [Karlstadt] have accepted it without petitioning the prince. Rather, as is becoming of subjects, they should humbly have made

complaint with the prince and the university, and requested that a Christian pastor be given them. If then he had not been willing, they could thereafter have planned as best they could.

Now however they plot without the knowledge of the prince, elect pastors and appoint them as they themselves please. They appear to regard their natural liege lord and reigning prince as so much dirt, whose possessions and prerogatives they wantonly wrest from him and take into their own hands. Indeed both Karlstadt and the Orlamünders have deserved a good strong jolt, as an example to other such bands, so that they would know that they have a sovereign and are not themselves lords in the land. However I would pardon and excuse the good people of Orlamünde on the ground that they were too feeble in the face of Dr. Karlstadt's overbearing spirit. Overcome by his humble bearing and high-sounding words (as is his custom), they were unable to see how they acted against their own lord. Possessed of a factious spirit, Dr. Karlstadt has my answer on the basis of what is apparent from the manner in which he has carried on in this situation, for he will not rest until he has tied the pitiable people to his person and set at naught temporal authority.

Beyond this, all would have been forgiven in honor of the gospel, if only he had not so stubbornly undertaken to defend himself. For when the university, by order of the prince, wrote and summoned him back to his duties and office in Wittenberg—yes indeed, my Karlstadt, will you come?—he aroused the poor people to reply to the university in such proud and arrogant tones that it was too much.[59] The university's summons was considered papistic and I don't know what. Nothing was evangelical, only what Dr. Karlstadt said and did with the Orlamünders. Now may a pious reader tell me, have not the princes of Saxony had enough patience with this mad spirit? Yes, unfortunately all too much. Had they been more diligent in wielding the sword, the rabble on the Saale would today be more peaceable and disciplined, and the spirit would not be domiciled there.

When no end to this game was in sight, but only rash action with total disregard of both the prince and the university, I nevertheless came to the Saale by order of the prince, and preached against such fanaticism as well as I could. Then the devil also welcomed me, in a way which I have no doubt long deserved. How he panted, rushed and writhed, just as if Christ had come to drive him out. Dr. Karlstadt even caught me off guard at the table with such a mild manner and gentle words that I instantly felt the "spirit" speak from him. Thereupon I pointed out to my gracious young lord, Duke John Frederick, that his grace should not put up with this, for what was being done [rather than said] was apparent. He would be factious and make naught of the authorities. This is how much I know about the matter, and no more.

And what should I say? There is no earnestness nor truth in what this spirit proposes. They do not even themselves believe what they say, nor keep what they promise, except this that the devil seeks only to cause trouble in the world. For when Dr. Karlstadt was last in Wittenberg he willingly agreed to leave the pastorate, since he saw that nothing else would do, and promised then that he would return to Wittenberg. Had he then been certain that he had been called to be pastor, he should not have given it up, but rather have given up his life, as until then he had struggled and defended himself. For one ought not to renounce a divine call when they [with whom one is associated] boast of having pure fellowship with God.

He seems to have been of the opinion that his poison was already sufficiently spread abroad, and the trouble now was rooted deeply and strongly enough, and that the populace would now stay with him as unfortunately is all too true, so that he could probably remain as

pastor there, even though the prince and the university wouldn't like it. Also an apparent surrender of the pastorate would do no harm, since the populace was so prepared that no one who succeeded him would prosper. Hence eventually the princes would have to leave him there, as indeed has been publicly suggested. Such devious and clever designs the spirit did not think that God could see or prevent. Thus he planned treacherously to secure his advantage before anyone was aware of it. Now we men easily lose in a gamble. The spirit surely lost, and God is found to be wiser than he is.

I have had to make this extended explanation, although very unwillingly, because the spiteful spirit is so prone to embellish himself to the shame of the princes of Saxony, by whose favor he receives honor and goods. I think also if he had not fled in such misery and despondency, but had had the moral courage at that time to request reasons [for his banishment] from the princes of Saxony, these and others, of which I am perhaps unaware, might have been indicated to him. Though more could be said about that, I am of the opinion that the land belongs to the princes of Saxony and not to Dr. Karlstadt, who is a guest therein and has nothing. When they take from no one what belongs to him and at the same time, for reasons of their own, no longer want someone in their land, I do not believe they are obligated to say to each one what has actuated them, nor to take the matter to court. For princes must conceal many things and keep them secret. If a landlord did not have the right and the power to ask a guest or a servant to move out, without first giving a reason and settling the matter in court, he would be but a poor landlord imprisoned in his own estate, and the guest would himself be landlord.

This spirit does not consider this, but presses on and attacks the princes with public abuse, as though he were their equal lord in the land of Saxony and defies them with the law in their own possessions. How shall one answer such an arrogant and venturesome head other than as the householder in the gospel says: "Friend, I am doing you no wrong … Take what belongs to you and go … Shall I not do what I choose with what belongs to me?" [Matt. 20:13–14]. This evil-eyed rogue also wanted to know the reason and justification for the householder's dealing with his possessions as he chose. Oh you fine spirit, to what extent are you able to conceal what you have in mind? You would be lord, and that which you affirm and do is to be considered right. That is the sum of it.

What think you now? Is it not a fine new spiritual humility? Wearing a felt hat and a gray garb, not wanting to be called doctor, but Brother Andrew and dear neighbor, as another peasant, subject to the magistrate of Orlamünde and obedient as an ordinary citizen. Thus with self-chosen humility and servility, which God does not command, he wants to be seen and praised as a remarkable Christian, as though Christian behavior consisted in such external hocus-pocus. At the same time he strives and runs counter to duty, honor, obedience, and the power and right of the reigning prince and the governing authority, which God has instituted. This is God's new sublime art, taught by the heavenly voice, which we at Wittenberg, who teach faith and love, do not understand and cannot know. This is the nice "turning from the material," the "concentration," the "adoration," the "self-abstraction," and similar devil's nonsense.[63]

Concerning the Mass

Herewith an answer has been given to several of Dr. Karlstadt's books. We shall now give our attention to the book which has to do with the mass,[65] so that we may deal specifically with the sacrament. For I do not know why he makes so many books, all of which deal with the same subject. He could well put on one page what he wastes on ten. Perhaps he likes to hear himself talk, as the stork its own clattering. For his writing is neither clear nor intelligible, and one would just as soon make one's way through brambles and bushes as to read through his books. This is a sign of the spirit. The Holy Spirit speaks well, clearly, in an orderly and distinct fashion. Satan mumbles and chews the words in his mouth and makes a hundred into a thousand. It is an effort to ascertain what he means.

Dr. Karlstadt has observed that we at Wittenberg opposed the mass as a sacrifice and a good work with great earnestness, both with writings and in action. Moreover, we were the first ones to do so. He was probably concerned that we receive honor therefrom and thus through vainglory be led to sin. He reasoned with himself how he might help us in the following way: What shall I do to bring the Wittenbergers into such disrepute that all their writings and deeds concerning the mass will mean nothing, and that they be defamed in their holding the mass as a sacrifice and a good work, and I alone be the hero that has brought into the world the awareness that the mass is not a sacrifice? I will do this. I will not pay attention to what they write, confess, or do. Then I could be no knight, for all this is too evident. I will inveigh against them because they call it a mass, which means a sacrifice, and because they elevate the sacrament as though they offered it. Then I can say: The Wittenbergers all grievously err, and with them the "poor bishop at Zwickau."

Well then, we must in turn be thankful for the good deed and see to it that the high honor also does not deceive the rich vagabond and "uncalled" preacher Karlstadt. In matters relating to the name of the mass and the elevation of the sacrament, we shall make reply in such manner that more shame than honor will come to him. Not that it is necessary to refute such childish tomfoolery other than to show that no good spark of true understanding is left in Dr. Karlstadt. Therefore, let everyone be on guard against this mad spirit, and not trust his splendid words. Lurking behind them are false, murderous snares, confusing the conscience with utterly unnecessary trickery.

First of all he takes us to task for calling the sacrament a mass, and accuses us of being Christ's hangmen and murderers, using other horrible words even worse than those used by the papists, because mass is supposed to mean sacrifice in Hebrew. Having taken the risk of contending with such earnestness that the mass is not a sacrifice is of no help to us. Even in the eyes of the world it is disgraceful, childish, and effeminate to be in agreement in substance and yet to quarrel about words. In forbidding this Paul calls such people, *logomaxous*, "word warriors," and wranglers, etc. [1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 2:14]. However it is the devil, as I have said, who would like to use Karlstadt's head, to burden conscience grievously with sin and horrible danger in things which are in themselves free and without sin. Therefore he has no peace unless he destroys good consciences and kills souls, which should live, as Ezekiel [18:19] says.

In the second place, if it really were true that mass means sacrifice, and there were a fragment of good in Dr. Karlstadt, he should have first informed and admonished us before publicly attributing to us such great vices before the whole world. Since we in fact deny and struggle against the mass as a sacrifice, it might have been expected that we would very gladly also drop the name, were we instructed that by using the name we make the mass a sacrifice.

What has happened to brotherly love in the high spirit? Is it no sin for these saints so grievously and shamefully to calumniate the neighbor without any cause? Plagued with blindness, Dr. Karlstadt pays no attention to nor does he recognize such truly great sins, as is apparent from his desire to burden the whole world with erroneous, imagined, and great sins. Acting in this manner is, in my opinion, to have the log in one's own eye and to want to take the speck out of another's eye [Matt. 7:5; Luke 6:42].

I have never known, also do not know now, that mass means sacrifice. Dr. Karlstadt must excuse me. Although I do not know much Hebrew, yet I am more competent to speak and to judge than he. I have now also almost translated the whole Bible into German, and I have not yet found that mass means a sacrifice. I think he must have found it written in the vent of a chimney, or recently invented his own Hebrew language, as he can invent sins and laws and a bad conscience, or probably the heavenly voice speaks in this way. It would be in order, when one does not understand a language, not to make claims for oneself in the field, and to give honor to those who are competent in it, so that no one might say: See, what a presumptuous ass he is! And especially when one would establish an article of faith, as Karlstadt here does, and hence raves: "I have dreamt that mass in Hebrew means sacrifice. Therefore the Wittenbergers seize, hang, murder, scourge Christ and are worse than Caiaphas, Judas, Herod, because they call it mass." Take it easy, factious spirit. If it were a carnival play, buffoonery would be in place.

In my Hebrew language I find that *mas* means tribute or tax, which one annually gives to the government, as in Gen. 49[:15]: "Issachar was tributary." And the Books of Kings often tells how land and people became tributary to the children of Israel. Hence on one occasion Moses calls the mass (Deut. 16[:10]) not the sacrifice, as Dr. Karlstadt dreams, but the first fruits, which they were willingly to bring to the priests on Pentecost, as an annual tribute, and there before the Lord through offering confess and give thanks, that they had received such fruits and the land from the Lord, as Moses very beautifully teaches (Deut. 26[:10, 18]). Even as also each tenant confesses through his tribute that he has received such money or goods from his liege lord. Sacrifice, however, is no tribute. It was also not commanded in the same way as the tribute. Thus one had to kill the sacrifice and burn it, so that mass and sacrifice agree together like the fist and the eye, although I have been compelled to translate Deut. 16[:10], "freewill offering." Of course, these spirits, who alone have the heavenly voice, do not pay any attention to my interpretation.

When the Hebrew language was still common among them, the apostles and the first Christians called the bread and wine, which they had gathered for observance of the sacrament, "mass," in Hebrew in accordance with Jewish custom. A part of it was consecrated for use in connection with the sacrament, the other was distributed among the servants of the congregation and the poor. For a long time afterwards this practice was also referred to as "collections," as the *Historia tripartita* testifies. Though the practice was discontinued the word "collect" still remains in the papist mass to indicate that collect and mass belong together, until the abomination [Mark 13:14; Dan. 11:31–12:11] came and made a sacrifice out of it. Therefore the word mass does not refer to the consecrated sacrament, which is an action involving God and man, but only to the gathering of bread and wine, involving men. It was not something given or offered to God, but distributed among men.

Where are you now, dear factious spirits and sin drovers, with your Hebrew language? Tell me why I should not call the Christian office a collect or mass, as the apostles and first Christians did? Yes, tell me, where have you gotten the lie from to blame us with calling the consecrated bread and wine a mass, even if mass means sacrifice? One calls the whole office a mass and says, "during the mass," or "in the mass," one consecrates the bread and wine. Also, in the mass one receives the sacrament. Who has ever heard it said, "I will receive the mass," or "I have received the mass" when one has received the sacrament? I do not know if I have even once written or said it. Be that as it may, I know for sure that we do not teach or speak so at Wittenberg, although there would be no danger if the sacrament were or were not called a mass. The lying spirit has certainly invented this about us, just as he as the result of his own dream calls mass a sacrifice, to demontsrate his wantonness.

What, however, if the apostles had also called the sacrament itself a mass? I think they would defend themselves quite well before the factious spirit and say: The Jews had to bring their mass, that is, their first fruits, to the priests, by which they gave nothing to God, but rather thereby confessed and thanked God, that they received these and the whole land from his grace. We observe the sacrament or our mass in a similar way. We do not celebrate it in order to give or offer something to God, but only that we may thereby confess and thank God, who has given us the same, together with all the riches of the kingdom of heaven, as also the words of Christ state: We should do this in his remembrance [1 Cor. 11:24, 25]. With this I think they would have quite well stopped the mouth of the spirit and instructed him, so that he might better learn the Hebrew language and Moses, before he slanders and condemns that which he neither knows nor understands.

This I say as though it were proven that mass is a Hebrew word, which I would not depend on. Whether it is Hebrew or not makes no difference, although it is much like the Hebrew. However what one would make into an article of faith by which to rule conscience must be something that is known much more definitely than one knows that mass is from the Hebrew. There is nothing of this in the Scripture. Besides, whatever occurs to or strikes the fancy of the scatterbrained, factious spirit must be a definite article of faith. After that speedily force it with fury and raging upon poor consciences, create sin where none exists, as is the nature of all his teaching and spirit. If a good spirit were moving him, he would first be sure of the matter, and prove that "mass" is Hebrew, before he interprets it in a Hebrew manner. Then he should also prove that it means sacrifice. Finally he should also demontsrate that one must not call it mass. He does none of this. He only slavers his drivel about, and this we are all to accept as an article of faith.

However, to portray the devil better, and show that he has no reason for lying in this way, but his whole undertaking is a pretense, I'll even suppose that mass means a sacrifice, and that in addition we expressly call not the office but the sacrament a sacrifice (neither of which occurs, but the factious spirit lies about both). What would that mean to him? Would we therefore be Christ's hangmen and murderers, as the factious spirit spurts? Or does it follow therefrom, that we consider the sacrament a sacrifice? Since he himself confesses that we do not consider it a sacrifice, how is he able to lie so brazenly and say we do at the same time consider it a sacrifice? But we cannot simultaneously believe and confess two contradictory things in one heart.

Yes, I will say further, that if we publicly confess with hearts, tongues, pens, and actions that it is no sacrifice, and besides that imprudently were to call it the mass, as do those who do not know that a mass is a sacrifice, would God not judge us more according to the heart and all other outward evidence rather than so on account of giving the appearance and using the name [mass] condemn us as the devil does through Dr. Karlstadt? For God himself says that he sees and judges according to the heart, not according to appearance (Isa. 11[:3]). Dr. Karlstadt, however, because of the external appearance of a name of whose meaning we are not sure slanders us so shamefully, and will neither judge according to the heart, nor take into account all of its fruits, which we show forth with deeds.

How often does not a mother call her daughter a little whore, both in anger and in love? How often does not a father call a son, "you fool," "you rogue"? Or they may call the daughter *putana*, and not know that *putana* means a whore, but think of a virgin. If Dr. Karlstadt's spirit would hear of this, he would curl his lip and rail: "Oh, the mother and the father are of the devil. They bring infamy upon God's creatures. They murder, hang, strangle, and mangle the precious virtue of virginity in their own child. They are indeed more evil than any keeper of prostitutes or murderer. With the heart and other outward evidence they show that the daughter is a pious virgin, but in calling her a little whore or *putana*, they do as much as a keeper of prostitutes who would take her to a brothel." Dear friend, what would the mother say to such a judge? She would beg for God's sake that one bind him with chains as a mad, raving man. By the same token, as Karlstadt well knows, we are not in earnest, even should we call the sacrament a sacrifice, although we do not do it. Yet in his judgment we consider it a sacrifice and for that reason he continues to slander us so outrageously. As is apparent, he only seeks occasion to slander us out of pure wantonness.

So senseless and possessed have envy and vain ambition made this man, that he no longer sees how the heart gives the name to the deed, and not the deed the name to the heart. If the heart is right and good, no matter what the name, it can do no harm. How can there be good and proper understanding of dealing with the Scripture or divine things in the head of one whose mind is so perverted that he has lost even the common understanding of the function of human reason? Does he not know that one must judge everything according to the belief and the fruits of the heart, not according to the name or appearance, as also all natural law teaches? Let those who will believe that such a teacher who, seeing all things through a colored glass and judging according to his embittered and false heart, writes correctly and in a Christian way about the sacrament. If he knows this and writes wantonly nevertheless, it's all the worse, as thereby one clearly perceives that he must be possessed. For a man who is in his right mind does not act so wantonly.

Now, what if in these days we went on and called the sacrament not mass, but in plain German a sacrifice, just to spite the factious spirit? Do you think we would be equal to the task? According to our way of thinking, all we have done at Wittenberg, and yet intend to do, will be so fashioned by God's grace that the devil with all gates of hell and factious spirits may assault, but will gain nothing, as is borne out by the past. Come now, I shall call the sacrament a sacrifice anew, not because I consider it a sacrifice but because the god of this factious spirit, the devil, would prevent me from calling it thus. I shall therefore do what he does not want me to do, and not do what he wants me to do. Moreover, I shall set forth the reason and basis for the action I propose.

I will call St. Peter a sinful fisherman, as he calls himself in the gospel [Luke 5:8], and say: "St. Peter, the poor sinner, has converted the world with his gospel" [Acts 2:41–42]. St. Paul, the persecutor of Christendom, is teacher of the gentiles [Acts 9:4; 1 Cor. 15:9]. St. Mary Magdalene, the sinner, has been saved [Luke 7:48], and the like. This I write in order to give Karlstadt's spirit occasion to write still more books (although nothing is commanded him) and thunder at me, saying: "The Wittenberg 'highminded preacher' defames the grace of God, the blood of Christ and the Holy Spirit, since he calls the saints sinners. With the heart he regards them as holy, but 'shrieks' (according to his German manner of speech) otherwise with the pen. Since he calls them sinners, he also regards them as such and turns them into sinners, murders and hangs Christ, and sheds his blood, etc." In this manner the "depth-minded" vagabond preacher is accustomed to carrying on.

Yes, I will even make it worse. I will call Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the crucified and one who died. Let the factious spirit demonstrate his skill and say: "Christ now sits in heaven and is no longer crucified. Since you however still call him thus, well then, to that extent you crucify him, and are worse than the Jews by whom he was crucified, even though you say otherwise with the heart and pen." How does that strike you? This spirit would eventually prevent us from using any names from previous history. For if I may not say of the mass, that it has been a sacrifice, and this is an abominable thing, in case I say: "Here is a sacrifice of the papists, or we receive the sacrifice" (note, that formerly was a sacrifice), then also we can no longer in the gospel call Simon the leper, Peter a sinner, nor Paul a persecutor, nor Christ the crucified. For all this is past and due to the devil and now is no more.

How often does it not happen that the evil name of a thing remains when the evil is gone? Should he who calls it by the evil name thereby make the same evil by so doing? Nothing could be worse than that someone now should crucify and kill God's Son. Yet since it occurred once the evil name remains forever; but no harm is done, since our heart, disposition, and all our deeds are turned in another direction than the name suggests. Should not allowance be made for a charitable interpretation when from habit, or the evil influence which the papists have exerted upon the sacrament, it is called a sacrifice, although we do not do it? Might I not call it a martyred, crucified, murdered sacrament, as Dr. Karlstadt himself does? For all this is included in the word "sacrifice." Can it be said that I martyr, crucify, and murder, and am like him who does it in deed, when I only use the name?

Therefore I ask the factious spirit and stuff his own words down his throat: "Say on, why do you call the bread and wine a 'martyred, crucified, murdered sacrament'? Are you not also executioners and murderers of Christ, even if you no doubt shriek otherwise with the pen?" If you say, however, that you don't thereby intend this, but only point out what others are doing—ah, dear squire, why can I not then also call it a sacrifice, with the meaning others have developed, rendered, and given? Do you not see, what all the world and even children see, that one is not to judge according to names and appearance, but according to the heart and the deed? I have said all this at greater length than necessary (as though there were some among us who call it a sacrifice), in order to show how unable the spirit is to accomplish anything. For even if his dreams were true, he would still achieve nothing. It stands to reason that a spirit who has lost the fundamental truth and deals only with externals, should have a theology of semblance and shadows.

To be sure, it is a sin and a shame, as has been said, to waste so many words and so much time and paper over these trifles. However it has been fruitful in that the mask has been pulled from this spirit and he has been brought into the light. Being aware of where Dr. Karlstadt has taken up his position, and what he has in mind, everyone will beware of him as of the devil. For that could be granted him as a person, if he taught something about names and semblance, but left alone and did not touch the fundamental truth in the heart and the deed. No one but the devil would stage such a useless show and with high-sounding words pretend as though everything depended on his contention. In addition, he outrageously condemns and slanders the true internal basis [of our position] which he himself admits we have and would eagerly have destroyed. For no upright, pious man behaves this way. Were he able to bring it about, he would do everything in his power to destroy utterly the good light of truth and the grace of God which has been given us at Wittenberg, and to persuade the people that through him the true sun had arisen at Orlamünde.

How does it look to you now? He who depended on Dr. Karlstadt's argument—how well would he manage with his mass? For he has not proved that the word "mass" is derived from the Hebrew, that it is a sacrifice and that one should not so call it. And even if he had proved all this, he would thereby have accomplished nothing except making himself and us the object of ridicule. If the papists would only cease offering the mass, dear God, how gladly would I not let them call it what they pleased. While the name makes no difference to me, Dr. Karlstadt makes everything depend on it, paying too little attention to the main argument, the foundation.

The other matter about the elevation of the sacrament is of the same kind. This must also be anti-Christian and papistic. Oh if someone could advise this man to leave both preaching and writing alone and do some other work! He is unfortunately not suited for it. He wants to make new laws and sins and set up new articles of faith. Whether it pleases God or not, he can do nothing else.

Already, at an early date, we have taught Christian liberty from [the writings] of St. Paul. There is to be freedom of choice in everything that God has not clearly taught in the New Testament, for example, in matters pertaining to various foods, beverages, attire, places, persons and various forms of conduct [Rom. 14:2–6; 1 Cor. 8:8–10]. We are obligated to do nothing at all for God, except believe and love. Now tell me, where has Christ forbidden us to elevate the sacrament or commanded us to elevate it? Show me one little word, and I will yield. Yet Dr. Karlstadt ventures to burst out and say that it is forbidden by Christ, and considers it a sin as great as the denial of God. He is unable to prove this. Nor is it true. Is it not a woeful, pitiable blindness, so to burden souls with sin and murder them, and make laws where none exist?

Tell me, my brother, what do you think of the spirit who dares command and direct the Christian to do what Christ does not do, yes to do that of which Christ does the opposite? For Christ does not forbid elevation, but leaves it to free choice. This spirit forbids it, and ensnares the conscience due to his own wanton ambition. Is not this to slander Christ? Is not this to deny Christ? Is not this to set oneself in Christ's place and in Christ's name to murder souls, bind consciences, burden with sins, make laws, and, in short, so to deal with souls as if one were their God? All this, and what more there is to be added, he does who makes law and sin where Christ would have freedom and no sin. For this same reason we have shown the pope to be the Antichrist, in that he infringes on such freedom with laws, where Christ would have freedom.

And my factious spirit blunders upon the same way. He would make captive what Christ would have free.

However in this respect the profile of the factious spirit differs from that of the pope. They both destroy Christian freedom, and they are both anti-Christian. But the pope does it through commandments, Dr. Karlstadt through prohibitions. The pope commands what is to be done, Dr. Karlstadt what is not to be done. Thus through them Christian freedom is destroyed in two ways: on the one hand, when one commands, constrains, and compels what is to be done, which is nevertheless not commanded or required by God; on the other hand, when one forbids, prevents, and hinders one from doing that which is neither prohibited nor forbidden by God. For my conscience is ensnared and misled just as much when it must refrain from doing something, which it is not necessary to refrain from doing, as when it must do something, which it is not necessary to do. When men must refrain from doing that from which they need not refrain and are compelled to do what they need not do, Christian freedom perishes in either case.

The pope destroys freedom in commanding outright that the sacrament is to be elevated, and would have it a statute and a law. He who refrains from keeping his law sins. The factious spirit destroys freedom in forbidding outright that the sacrament be elevated, and would have it a prohibition, a statute, and a law. He who does not act in accordance with this law sins. Here Christ is driven away by both parties. One pushes him out of the front [door], the other drives him out the rear [door]. One errs on the left side, the other on the right, and neither remains on the path of true freedom. I am very much surprised, however, and had I not read it myself in Dr. Karlstadt's books, the whole world could not have convinced me that he should not know this, for I have, you know, instructed him in this and considered him sensible. Oh, Lord God, what are we when thou lettest us fall? What can we do when thine hand is removed? What can we achieve when thou no longer enlightenest us? Is this free will and its power, that so quickly makes out of the learned man a child, out of the intelligent a fool, out of the wise man a madman? How terrible art thou in all Thy works and judgments [Ps. 66:3].

Well, dear Sirs, let us walk in the light, while we have it, lest the darkness overtake us [John 12:35]. And let him who can, perceive. I will discuss the matter in broad terms.

Teaching and doing are two things. I say, furthermore, that one should separate teaching and doing as far from each other as heaven from earth. Teaching belongs only to God. He has the right and the power to command, forbid, and be master over the conscience. However, to do and refrain from doing belong to us so that we may keep God's commandment and teaching. Where doing or to refrain from doing is in question, and concerning which God has taught, commanded, and forbidden nothing, there we should permit free choice as God himself has done. Whoever though goes beyond this by way of commandments or prohibition invades God's own sphere of action, burdens the conscience, creates sin and misery, and destroys all that God has left free and certain. In addition he expels the Holy Spirit with all his kingdom, work, and word, so that nothing but devils remain.

Now the elevation of the sacrament, wearing the tonsure, putting on the chasuble and alb, etc., are matters concerning which God has given neither commandments nor prohibitions. Therefore everyone is to have freedom of choice to do these things or refrain from doing them. God wants us to have such freedom, etc. Since the pope does not allow for such freedom of action, but curbs it with his teaching and commandment, he usurps the office of God and sets

himself arrogantly in God's place, as St. Paul has forewarned concerning him [2 Thess. 2:4]. He makes sin where God would have no sin, and thereby kills souls and binds consciences. Since Dr. Karlstadt does not allow for freedom to refrain from doing what need not be done, but compels with prohibitions and teaching, saying one must not elevate the host, etc., he also usurps the office of God and sets himself in his place. He makes sin where there neither can nor should be any sin. Thus he kills souls on this side, as does the pope on the other side, and both of them, like murderers of souls, destroy Christian liberty.

We however take the middle course and say: There is to be neither commanding nor forbidding, neither to the right nor to the left. We are neither papistic nor Karlstadtian, but free and Christian, in that we elevate or do not elevate the sacrament, how, where, when, as long as it pleases us, as God has given us the liberty to do. Just as we are free to remain outside of marriage or to enter into marriage, to eat meat or not, to wear the chasuble or not, to have the cowl and tonsure or not. In this respect we are lords and will put up with no commandment, teaching, or prohibition. We have also done both here in Wittenberg. For in the cloister we observed mass without chasuble, without elevation, in the most plain and simple way which Karlstadt extols [as following] Christ's example. On the other hand, in the parish church we still have the chasuble, alb, altar, and elevate [the host] as long as it pleases us.

Therefore my factious spirit ought not fight against us Wittenbergers in this manner: "They elevate the sacrament. Therefore they sin against God." But this might be said, "They teach and command that one must elevate the sacrament lest there be mortal sin. Therefore they sin against God." For so the papists do and teach. We however do not so teach, and yet permit freedom to do this as long as it pleases us. The doing does no harm; the teaching, however, is the very devil. On the other hand, in the cloister we refrain from it, but we do not so teach as Dr. Karlstadt does The refraining does no harm; the teaching, however, is the very devil. From this you may gather, who are "the cousins of the Antichrist," we or Dr. Karlstadt. We do as the papists, but we do not tolerate their teaching, commandment, and constraint. We refrain from doing like the Karlstadtians, but we do not tolerate the prohibition. Thus the pope and Dr. Karlstadt are true cousins in teaching, for they both teach, one the doing, the other the refraining. We, however, teach neither, and do both.

Now, dear sirs, we are speaking of minor matters, insofar as the doing is concerned. For what does it mean to elevate the sacrament? But when the teaching is taken into account we are dealing with the most important matters. The factious spirit is too frivolous and meddles all too impudently in this matter. He has such a low regard for teaching and such a high regard for the doing that he does not see the beam in his own eye, and is too much concerned with the splinter in our eye [Matt. 7:5]. For with teaching he manhandles conscience, which Christ has won with his own blood, and kills souls, which God has dearly purchased, with commandments and sins. For thereby the kingdom of Christ will be destroyed and everything that the gospel has brought us exterminated. For Christ cannot remain in the conscience that goes whoring after alien teaching and the commandments of men. There faith must perish. Therefore let everyone know that Dr. Karlstadt has a spirit which is hostile to faith and to the whole kingdom of God, which he in turn would destroy with his conceit and human nonsense, as you may well understand from this part of the discussion and concerning which you will hear more later.

However, we thank him kindly for teaching us that Christ did not elevate the sacrament in the Last Supper, although we also already knew this, and almost as well as he. We are talking

here about teaching, not doing, and beg him to show us where Christ teaches or forbids elevation. We already know where he refrains from doing it or does not do it. But we are of the opinion that it is not necessary to do or refrain from doing all that Christ has done or refrained from doing. Otherwise we would also have to walk on the sea, and do all the miracles that he has done. Furthermore, we would have to refrain from marriage, abandon temporal authority, forsake field and plow, and all that he has refrained from doing. For that which he would have us do or not do, he has not only done or not done himself, but in addition he has explained in words that command and forbid what we are to do and refrain from doing. For when he says, John 16 [John 13:15]. "I have given you an example, that you also should do as I have done to you," he applies this, not to Lazarus, whom he had raised from the dead, but to the act of footwashing.

Therefore we will admit no example, not even from Christ himself, much less from other saints, for it must also be accompanied by God's Word, which explains to us in what sense we are to follow or not to follow it. We do not consider works and examples adequate, indeed we do not want to follow any example: we want the Word, for the sake of which all works, examples and miracles occur. For certainly he is sufficiently wise and articulate, and able to anticipate the future so as to indicate in words everything which is commanded or forbidden. Well now, heigh, you factious spirits, rave on as best you can and show us, where has Christ with one tittle forbidden the elevation of the sacrament? Since you still boast and bluster that Christ prohibits it, where is the prohibition? I imagine it is to be found in the nightgown of the bride in Orlamünde, or in the trousers of the bridegroom in Naschhausen.[79]

If the rule is to be that one is so strictly to follow the example of Christ and not the Word alone, then it will follow that we should observe the Last Supper nowhere but in Jerusalem, in the upper room. For if incidental circumstances are to be strictly binding, the external places and persons must also strictly be adhered to. And it will come to this, that this Last Supper was only to be observed by the disciples, who were the only ones who were addressed at that time and commanded to observe it.[81] And what St. Paul says (1 Cor. 11[:17ff.]) will become utter foolishness. Also since we do not know and the text does not state whether red or white wine was used, whether wheat rolls or barley bread were used, we must by reason of doubt at this point refrain from observing the Last Supper, until we become certain about it, so that we do not make any external detail differ a hairsbreadth from what Christ's example sets forth. Yes, we must also previously in a Jewish manner have eaten the paschal lamb. Also, since the text does not state whether Christ took it in his hands and himself distributed it to each one, we must also wait until it is ascertained, so that we do not elevate and administer it differently than Christ did. For where we overlook this, the factious spirit appears and cries: We hang, murder, and crucify Christ. This matter is so very important, and salvation is buried here much more than in Christ's wounds, blood, word, and spirit.

Oh the blindness and the mad fanaticism of such great heavenly prophets, who boast of daily speaking with God! Children would be ashamed to jest in so coarse a manner. At this point I recall a prediction which was made concerning Dr. Karlstadt when he first embraced our teaching. It was said: "Yes, Dr. Karlstadt will not stay with it long. He is an unstable person, and has never stuck to one thing." At that time I would not believe it. Now I see it before my very eyes. For he has completely fallen again from faith into works, and unfortunately into human or rational works, which he himself has invented. In summing up we assert that we observe

everything in the sacrament that Christ by his words has commanded, when he says: “Do this in remembrance of me” [1 Cor. 11:24]. However, in matters which he has not forbidden we act as freely as it pleases us, saying: No one is to command or prohibit anything which he has neither commanded nor forbidden.

And although I had intended also to abolish the elevation, now I will not do it, to defy for a while the fanatic spirit, since he would forbid it and consider it a sin and make us depart from our liberty. For before I would yield a hairsbreadth or for a moment to this soul-murdering spirit and abandon our freedom (as Paul teaches) [Gal. 5:1], I would much rather tomorrow become a strict monk and observe all the monastic rules as stringently as I ever did. This matter of Christian liberty is nothing to joke about. We want to keep it as pure and inviolate as our faith, even if an angel from heaven were to say otherwise [Gal. 1:8]. It has cost our dear, faithful Savior and Lord Jesus Christ too much. It is also altogether too necessary for us. We may not dispense with it without the loss of our salvation.

At this point you should carefully examine Dr. Karlstadt’s spirit, noting the way he proceeds, how he would tear us from the Word and lead us toward works. To achieve this all the better, and to make a good impression, he holds before you the works of Christ himself, so that you might thereby be alarmed and think: Oh, really, who should not follow Christ? And yet all the while he conceals the Word. For he has none to which he can point. For after he has seen how we will pay no attention to human words and works, be they ever so holy or ancient, etc., and would have Christ alone as our master, the rogue divides Christ into two parts. Namely, how Christ, on the one hand, without words does and refrains from doing certain works, and, on the other hand, how with words he does and refrains from doing works. Dr. Karlstadt is so knavish that he presents Christ alone as he does and refrains from doing without words, wherein he is not to be followed by us, and is silent where Christ does and refrains from doing with words, wherein we are to follow him.

Do you see here the devil, who before has misled us through saints? He would now mislead us through Christ himself. Beware where you do not hear God’s word commanding or forbidding you so that you may not be led astray and pay no attention to it, even if Christ himself did it. Has not enough been said? We read: “Thy word is a lamp to my feet” (Ps. 119[:105]). The Word, the Word is to be followed, don’t you hear? When one now holds before you how Christ has done it, speak up briskly: Very well, he has done it. Has he also taught and commanded it to be done? Also if one holds before you, this Christ has not done, then speak up briskly: Has he also forbidden it? And if they cannot point to his Word, then say: Put it aside, let it be. That doesn’t apply to me. Nor is it an example, it is his work, done for his own part. If they say: All of Christ’s doing is for our instruction, let them say it. But note carefully what is meant with instruction. A man has said it. He has as much authority as you yourself.

So it is in the world, as the saying goes: He who cannot sing always wants to sing, whoever cannot preach or write, he wants to preach and write. But whoever can, he hesitates and does so reluctantly. Dr. Karlstadt, who hereby proves that he doesn’t understand Christ at all, just as above he doesn’t understand Moses, must preach and write when no one has commanded or requested him to do so, and when he is requested to do so, he does not do it. He interprets Moses in such a way that the disorderly populace is incited to punish public misdeed. However, Dr. Karlstadt does not and cannot teach Moses spiritually, as he reveals sin and physically drives rough and rude people to works. He constructs his own Moses. Thus here he also constructs his

own Christ, that we are to follow his works without the Word. But he does not understand how Christ is first of all our salvation, and thereafter his works with the Word are our example. He knows no more about the New Testament than he does about the Old, and yet he would write about the sacrament and such matters, as though there were great need for his absurd and blind art, and; indeed, his folly.

For how is a true understanding of Moses or the law possible, so that the knowledge of sin is taught (Rom. 3[:20], and rough people are driven to works (Lev. 18[:4–5]), when one so interprets it that the disorderly populace is to revolt and usurp the office of the temporal authority, and thereby overturn the whole order and meaning of the law? Furthermore, how is it possible for anyone to understand Christ correctly, as he is given to us in faith unto life, and his words and works are given in love as an example, who goes off in another direction and only emphasizes how we, bidden and unforbidden, are to regard Christ's works as a necessary example and are to follow them? There faith and love together with the whole gospel must perish. And that is why they speak so scornfully of the doctrine of faith and love, as even Dr. Karlstadt himself threw it in my face in Jena, just as if they knew something much higher and better. Yet they do not speak out plainly, nor do they want to bring it out into the open. Even when taken by itself this behavior shows that the devil speaks through them, since they ridicule the doctrine of faith and love, that is, Christ himself with his gospel.

Thereafter the man comes again in his Hebrew language and contends thus against us: "The Wittenbergers elevate the sacrament. Therefore they regard it as an offering. For they do precisely what the law of Moses prescribes, in which there were two offerings, the heave offering and the wave offering. [Exod. 35:5, 22; Num. 18:8, 11]. He who elevates makes a heave offering, etc." This goes beyond all bounds! If this is not blindness, what then is blindness? This spirit calls everything that one elevates an offering, and argues from the particular to the universal. Thus, there is one elevation in the law which is an offering; therefore all elevation is offering. This would be as if I were to say: One finds an elevation which is an offering; therefore elevation of all kinds is an offering. Or thus, a cow in Orlamünde is black; therefore all cows in the world are black. I must speak in a lay and rustic manner with the new layman[87] and peasant. Here we see what the plowman from Naschhausen is able to do, of whom Dr. Karlstadt boasted at Jena, that he would put all the doctors in the world to shame. When the maid lifts the mirror to look at herself, she offers it. When the farmer lifts the ax or the flail, to chop or to thresh, he offers it. When the mother raises the child and dandles it, she offers it. Therefore she trespasses against Christ's prohibition, hangs, murders, slays, crucifies Christ and does all the evil that those do who offer Christ. How the fanatic spirit raves! For the plowman at Naschhausen has said it: he who elevates, offers.

Tell me, has not this peasant amply deserved that one should set his plow right? In this manner God ought to cast down those who rise and set themselves against the knowledge of God and resolve to act on a knowledge of their own. The Egyptians were not to be stricken with a common darkness, but with one that could be felt [Exod. 10:21]. In my opinion an attitude of this kind implies the loss of reason, sense, and understanding. The papists themselves have never been so foolhardy nor of the opinion that they offered the sacrament by elevating it, although they otherwise regard it as a sacrifice. But they elevate it in order to show it to the people, to remind them of the passion of Christ, etc. For this reason the priest doesn't say a

word, either about sacrifice or anything else, when he elevates it. How should we then offer it through the elevation, we who insist so strongly that it is no sacrifice?

But it is the same fiddle upon which he always fiddles, namely, that the external appearance is the main thing, according to which everything that the heart, mouth, pen, and hand confesses is to be regarded and judged. Therefore it does not help that we believe with the heart, confess with the mouth, testify with the pen, and demonstrate with deeds that we do not regard the sacrament as a sacrifice, though we still elevate it. The elevation is so important and by itself counts for so much, that it outweighs and condemns everything else. Is this not a vexatious spirit, who so juggles with external appearance against the truth in the spirit? If only the elevation were permitted to remain an external matter, the brides would be truly undressed and naked regardless of how one felt about it in his heart.

However enough has been said above about this harping on external appearance. I point it out now only in order that I might also undress the spirit and expose how he is occupied with sheer foolishness. He is unable to deal properly with the main articles of Christian doctrine, and yet he presses such foolishness so severely on the conscience, with such bombastic words, as though these were the main articles, on which everything depended. I do it so that everyone will know how to guard against this spirit, who is always seeking to set up new articles of faith, though God knows nothing of them, and to enforce a new teaching, which has not been entrusted to him.

This however I have said as though it were true and conceded that possibly an elevation could take place which would be an offering, as this spirit pretends. But no man on earth calls elevation an offering, except this spirit, who has invented this and sought to burden us with it, since he did not know anything else to write about. Nor will he ever be able to show where elevation means a sacrifice. He himself has forgotten his own words, where he says: Sacrifice is equivalent to slaying, killing, hanging, murdering, burning, etc. Who, however, would be so mad as to say that elevating was the same as slaying, killing, murdering, burning? Only this spirit, who perhaps also learns a new German from his heavenly voice. Thereupon he raves and fights against himself, in that whoever elevates, sacrifices.

To demonstrate his excellent command of the Hebrew language, he produces from the Hebrew the two words *thnupa* and *thruma*, which I have translated wave offering and heave offering, or heave and wave. The world is to marvel at the plowman of Naschhausen's understanding of the Hebrew language. Yet it is not the common Hebrew, which every one speaks, but that which the spirit teaches anew and daily, with the aid of the heavenly voice. For my Hebrew language teaches me that before one offers something according to the law, one must heave and wave it. And it must be heaved and waved so as to acknowledge God and give thanks to him as for a gift, which is not offered or given to God, but received from him. Just as I have said above about the term "mass."[92] Only after it had been heaved and waved was it offered and kindled, so that even in the law heave and wave cannot by any means be sacrifice.

Behold, what expert knowledge this spirit has of the law of Moses and the Hebrew, and yet he is so arrogant and wanton that he builds articles of faith on such dreams of his, and would have the consciences so completely ensnared thereby, that they become Christ's murderers, hangmen, and executioners, if they elevate the sacrament. Thus the devil must always have his mouth full of slander in order to destroy Christ.

Dr. Karlstadt has fallen from the kingdom of Christ and has suffered shipwreck with respect to faith. Therefore he wants to get us out of the kingdom right into works and simply make Galatians of us also. For take note, dear reader, what gross blindness it is to fight as he does. "If anyone circumcise himself, should he not in all fairness be called a Jew? Thus, whoever elevates is rightly called one who brings a sacrifice, etc." You poor, miserable spirit, where on earth have you read that he is rightly called a Jew who circumcises himself? Did not Paul circumcise Timothy, when he was already baptized and a Christian? (Acts 16[:3]). Does not Paul declare circumcision a matter of free choice (1 Cor. 7[:19]), "Neither circumcision counts for anything nor uncircumcision," that is, one may circumcise himself or not, have a foreskin or not. And this spirit pits his judgment blithely and boldly against that of Paul, saying it is not a matter of free choice, but makes one a Jew. He ought rather say that whoever circumcises himself as though he were compelled to do so by law and for conscience's sake, he is rightly a Jew. For circumcision does not make a Jew, since one does find those who due to illness or on account of an infection must be circumcised. Should they therefore be called Jews?

He, however, is a Jew who, compelled in his conscience by law, feels he must be circumcised. This Jewish disposition and conscience makes one a Jew, even if he never externally circumcised himself or could circumcise himself. The foreskin thus makes no one a Jew. But if he thinks in his conscience, he must have a foreskin, this one is a gentile, even if he permitted himself to be circumcised a thousand times externally. Similarly, since he thinks it necessary to have the foreskin and to condemn circumcision without leaving it free choice as Christ would have it, Dr. Karlstadt actually is a gentile and has lost Christ. Here one sees clearly how this man is completely swallowed up in works and drowned in external appearance, so that he is not able to give one single right judgment in spiritual matters of conscience. For it is impossible that a spark of Christian understanding should still be found in him, since he holds that an external work makes a Jew or Christian, gentile or Turk, and does not judge according to the conscience, but according to semblance and appearance, which even reasonable people do not do.

In this instance, too, he should have said, "Whoever elevates the sacrament out of necessity of conscience, as if he had to elevate it, would also be a Jew." But we do not do so, as he well knew. Therefore he feared that he would be put to shame, as one who publicly lies against us. But he did not see that he hereby acquires much greater shame, in that he lies against God and forbids an action, as condemned by God's prohibition, that God, however, has not forbidden. On the other hand, whoever insists that the sacrament may not be elevated, as a matter of necessity is a gentile. In doing this Dr. Karlstadt sets up a law compelling the conscience, which only God has a right to do. But whoever elevates the sacrament with such a conscience and the intention of making it an offering, is one who sacrifices, and a papist. For where such a conscience exists, there one sacrifices, even if one never elevated the sacrament or even sank it into a deep well. Where, however, such a conscience does not exist, there one does not sacrifice, even if one raised it above the heavens and the whole world shouted: Sacrifice, sacrifice! For everything depends on the conscience. Of this the fanatic spirit knows nothing, or does not want to know anything.

I imagine the reading of this treatise will annoy many, since it deals with such charlatanry. But how can I avoid it? This mad spirit drives me to it. Yet, as I said above, we have some fruit from it in that we defend and understand more clearly our Christian freedom. We also

recognize this false spirit for what he is and see how he is blind and stupid in all things. Everyone may therefore govern himself accordingly. For since he does not understand such trifling [external] things, but so magnifies them as to usurp the office of God, making laws, sin, and matters of conscience, where none exist, destroying Christian liberty, and enticing consciences away from an understanding of grace to external works and appearance, so that Christ is denied, his kingdom destroyed, and the gospel reviled—who then can hope that he will ever be able to write or teach anything that is good? For certainly one can prove from this matter that the spirit of Christ is lacking. It must be the devil that is there, and so he is. Let each one govern himself accordingly.

I am happy the mass now is held among the Germans in German. But to make a necessity of this, as if it had to be so, is again too much. This spirit cannot do anything else than continually create laws, necessity, problems of conscience and sin. To be sure, I have read in 1 Cor. 14[:27–28] that he who speaks with tongues is to be silent in the congregation when no one understands anything of what he says. One tends however to skip over the other words: "Unless there is someone to interpret." That is, St. Paul permits speaking with tongues, "if at the same time it is interpreted," so that one understands it. Therefore he also commands that they are not to prevent those who speak with tongues, etc. Now we administer the sacrament to no one unless he understands the words in the sacrament, as one well knows. So in this matter we do not act contrary to St. Paul, since we satisfy his intention. If we do not satisfy this spirit, who only looks at external works and has no regard for either conscience or intentions, it is of no importance. We attach no importance to his new articles of faith.

I would gladly have a German mass today. I am also occupied with it. But I would very much like it to have a true German character. For to translate the Latin text and retain the Latin tone or notes has my sanction, though it doesn't sound polished or well done. Both the text and notes, accent, melody, and manner of rendering ought to grow out of the true mother tongue and its inflection, otherwise all of it becomes an imitation, in the manner of the apes. Now since the enthusiast spirit presses that it must be, and will again burden the conscience with law, works, and sins, I will take my time and hurry less in this direction than before, only to spite the sin-master and soul-murderer, who presses upon us works, as if they were commanded by God, though they are not.

For whoever goes to the sacrament understanding these words in German or having them clearly in his heart: "Take, eat; this is my body," etc. [Matt. 26:26], which he has learned and borne in mind from a foregoing sermon, and thereupon and therewith receives the sacrament, he receives it rightly and does not merely hear speaking with tongues, but something which has real meaning. On the other hand he who does not comprehend or understand these words in his heart, nor thereupon receives the sacrament, such a one would not be helped if a thousand preachers stood around his ears and shouted themselves into a frenzy with such words. However for the mad spirit everything depends on external works and appearance, which out of his own head he would continually set up as necessary and as an article of faith, without God's commandment.

Also the fool doesn't understand St. Paul's words correctly when he writes of speaking with tongues (1 Cor. 14[:2–29]). For St. Paul writes of the office of preaching in the congregation, to which it is to listen and to learn from it, when he says: Whoever comes forward, and wants to read, teach, or preach, and yet speaks with tongues, that is, speaks Latin instead of German, or

some unknown language, he is to be silent and preach to himself alone. For no one can hear it or understand it, and no one can get any benefit from it. Or if he should speak with tongues, he ought, in addition, put what he says into German, or interpret it in one way or another, so that the congregation may understand him. Thus St. Paul is not as stubborn in forbidding speaking with tongues as this sin-spirit is, but says it is not to be forbidden when along with it interpretation takes place.

Hence has come the custom in all lands, to read the gospel immediately before the sermon in Latin, which St. Paul calls speaking in tongues in the congregation. However, since the sermon comes soon thereafter and translates and interprets the tongue, St. Paul does not reject or forbid it. Why should I then, or anyone condemn it? Yes, would to God, that only this order of St. Paul were everywhere in effect so that after the Latin gospel nothing else was preached than its exposition. Now this enthusiast spirit would condemn everything that St. Paul permits and forbids one not to condemn. In addition he will allow no singing or Latin word, and applies the teaching of St. Paul about speaking with tongues not to the office of preaching alone, but to all external forms. This is always his method, though these forms are not essential.

Not that I would oppose using nothing but German in the mass, but I will not endure that some one without God's Word and out of his own arrogance and wantonness forbids the reading of the Latin gospel and makes sin where none exists, lest we get the factious spirit with his fanaticism as master in the place of God. For we cannot establish or strengthen our cause against the papists with such charlatanry. Otherwise we would stand before them in disgrace. Our whole basis must be certain and the words of God pure upon which we build and do combat against the papists, so that they are unable honestly to oppose our arguments. For even if we now get the mass in German, it will still not be enough to speak the words of the sacrament in German. For they must be spoken earlier and beforehand, before we receive the sacrament, so that they who go to receive it might have the words in the heart and not in the ears. What difference does it make if they do not hear in the sacrament, if, immediately preceding the reception they have heard the words in the sermon and have comprehended them, and then make their confession, unless one would yell the same words in the ears of everyone who goes to receive the sacrament, and consecrate the sacrament as many times as there are individuals to receive it.

I had intended to answer everything in one book, but I am too pressed and it will become too large. Therefore I must abruptly break off here and begin another about the sacrament. Nor do I have all of his poisonous books of which they boast. You will not have to wait long, for I have written this in a short time. The other one will follow in the footsteps of this one, if God wills. To him be praise and glory eternally. Amen.

PART II

Our controversy has no doubt given great joy to the papists and inspired among them the hope that our cause would thereby suffer defeat. So be it, let them boast and exalt over us. Often and repeatedly I have said that if our cause is of God no one will be able to suppress it. If it is not of God, I will not be able to support it whatever some one else does. I can lose nothing by it for I have won nothing. But this I know that no one but God himself can take it from me. However much I regret this vexation, I am glad that the devil now reveals himself and his

shamefulness through these heavenly prophets. They have long grumbled to themselves and would not even have come out into the open unless I had lured them out through a gulden. This I believe, by God's grace, to be a good investment which I do not regret.

I am not worried as long as God is with me. I know and am sure who is Master of the situation. He has not hitherto failed me in the face of many a hard blow. He will not now fail me. He who has the gospel can be confident and calm. We have a joyful trust and are of good courage. We have as adversaries dejected, stupid, despairing, and anxious spirits who tremble at the rustling of a leaf [Lev. 26:36], but, as always with the godless (Ps. 36[:2]), know no fear of God but do violence to his Word and work. God is concealed and cannot be seen or felt. Were he a present, visible person, he could drive them out of the land with a stem of straw.

For this spirit has wrought thus: At first he sneaked around in the land upsetting things and seeking followers. Then when he thought he had a following he emerged boldly, thinking all was won. But his trust is not in God, though his followers claim that God speaks to them. Rather, he depends on the favor of the populace and builds on flesh and blood. For when God compels anyone to speak, such a one makes public proclamation, even if he is alone and no one follows him, as in the case of Jeremiah [Jer. 2:2ff.]. I too can claim that this was my way. It is the way of the devil to glide around in secrecy and in conspiracy, afterward making the excuse that at first his spirit was not strong enough. No, Sir Devil, the spirit that is of God makes no such excuse. I know you well.

The true nature of the devil is not yet apparent. For he has still other ideas which I have smelled for a long time. They too will be revealed, if God wills. It has come to the point, God be praised, when this is not particularly my affair. There are plenty of others who can answer such a spirit, without my having to be involved with him during my life. I am well aware that Dr. Karlstadt has been cooking this brew for a long time without being able to get anything under way. I have also known that he could not do it any better than he has done no matter how long he chewed on his clever notions. For no art or wit or imagination is of avail before God. With one word he can bring all to shame. He knows that human thoughts are vain [Prov. 21:30].

If anyone is so weak that he has fallen before this onslaught and now has doubts about the sacrament, let him follow that advice and get along for a while without the sacrament. Let him busy himself with the Word of God, in faith and love, and let those who are secure in their conscience concern themselves with the sacrament. You are not condemned if you are without the sacrament. But let the papists who rejoice over this controversy beware lest they harden their hearts. For it is not the first time God has ordered things so that he appears foolish and weak and his Word and purpose seem on the point of extinction, in order that the godless should thereby be hardened and blinded. At such times God's purpose has emerged the more strongly, and they who were hardened and blinded by his seeming foolishness and weakness have been the more terribly destroyed. Such was the case of the Jews when Christ was crucified and such the case when the martyrs were made to suffer [1 Cor. 1:18ff.].

Just as the devil is disorderly and jumbles things together, so Dr. Karlstadt's treatise and head are equally disordered and mixed up, so that it is exceedingly annoying to read and difficult to remember what he writes. Yet I will try to create some order in view of his passion and poison and to consider his argument part by part. I would first present in broad outline the fundamental idea from which all his raving emanates, so that the reader may be more clear in observing and judging this spirit. This is the argument.

Out of his great mercy God has again given us the pure gospel, the noble and precious treasure of our salvation. This gift evokes faith and a good conscience in the inner man, as is promised in Isa. 55[:1], that his Word will not go forth in vain, and Rom. 10[:17], that "faith comes through preaching." The devil hates this gospel and will not tolerate it. Since he has not succeeded hitherto in opposing it with power of sword, he now, as indeed always, seeks victory by deceit and false prophets. I ask you, Christian reader, to observe carefully. If God wills I will help you to discern the devil in these prophets so that you can yourself deal with him. It is for your good, not mine, that I write. Follow me thus:

Now when God sends forth his holy gospel he deals with us in a twofold manner, first outwardly, then inwardly. Outwardly he deals with us through the oral word of the gospel and through material signs, that is, baptism and the sacrament of the altar. Inwardly he deals with us through the Holy Spirit, faith, and other gifts. But whatever their measure or order the outward factors should and must precede. The inward experience follows and is effected by the outward. God has determined to give the inward to no one except through the outward. For he wants to give no one the Spirit or faith outside of the outward Word and sign instituted by him, as he says in Luke 16[:29], "Let them hear Moses and the prophets." Accordingly Paul can call baptism a "washing of regeneration" wherein God "richly pours out the Holy Spirit" [Titus 3:5]. And the oral gospel "is the power of God for salvation to every one who has faith" (Rom. 1[:16]).

Observe carefully, my brother, this order, for everything depends on it. However cleverly this factious spirit makes believe that he regards highly the Word and Spirit of God and declaims passionately about love and zeal for the truth and righteousness of God, he nevertheless has as his purpose to reverse this order. His insolence leads him to set up a contrary order and, as we have said, seeks to subordinate God's outward order to an inner spiritual one. Casting this order to the wind with ridicule and scorn, he wants to get to the Spirit first. Will a handful of water, he says, make me clean from sin? The Spirit, the Spirit, the Spirit, must do this inwardly. Can bread and wine profit me? Will breathing over the bread bring Christ in the sacrament? No, no, one must eat the flesh of Christ spiritually. The Wittenbergers are ignorant of this. They make faith depend on the letter. Who ever does not know the devil might be misled by these many splendid words to think that five holy spirits were in the possession of Karlstadt and his followers.

But should you ask how one gains access to this same lofty spirit they do not refer you to the outward gospel but to some imaginary realm, saying: Remain in "self abstraction" where I now am and you will have the same experience. A heavenly voice will come, and God himself will speak to you. If you inquire further as to the nature of this "self abstraction," you will find that they know as much about it as Dr. Karlstadt knows of Greek and Hebrew. Do you not see here the devil, the enemy of God's order? With all his mouthing of the words, "Spirit, Spirit, Spirit," he tears down the bridge, the path, the way, the ladder, and all the means by which the Spirit might come to you. Instead of the outward order of God in the material sign of baptism and the oral proclamation of the Word of God he wants to teach you, not how the Spirit comes to you but how you come to the Spirit. They would have you learn how to journey on the clouds and ride on the wind. They do not tell you how or when, whither or what, but you are to experience what they do.

Again, in external matters which they believe God has not directly ordered, they act like incendiaries as if they were out of their minds. Just as they have fashioned their own inner spirit, so they have created also their own external order, though God has given neither commands nor prohibitions to the effect that we may not have images, churches, or altars, that we may not use the word "mass," speak of a sacrament and its elevation, or wear chasuble instead of gray coats, and we ought to address one another as neighbor "dear." They advocate the murder of godless rulers,[103] will endure no injustice, and assume, in many cases, a pretense of humility and piety of much importance to themselves but of no meaning before God. Whoever differs from them is a papist twice over who crucifies or murders Christ; indeed, those who differ from them are Scribes. Whoever agrees with them, however, is up to his boots in the spirit and is a learned light. O wonderful saints! If you ask who directs them to teach and act in this way, they point upward and reply, "Ah, God tells me so, and the Spirit says so." Indeed all idle dreams are nothing but God's Word. What do you think of these fellows? Do you fully grasp what kind of a spirit this is?

They pay no attention to God's design of inward things, such as faith. They approach and force all external words and Scriptures belonging to the inward life of faith into new forms of putting to death the old Adam. They invent such things as "turning from the material," "concentration," "adoration," "self-abstraction," and other such foolishness which has not an inkling of foundation in Scripture. My Karlstadt plunges in like a sow to devour pearls, and like a dog tearing holy things to pieces [Matt. 7:6]. What Christ has said and referred to the inner life of faith, this man applies to outward, self-contrived works, even to the point of making the Lord's Supper and the recognition and remembrance of Christ a human work, whereby we in like manner, in "passionate ardor" and (as they stupidly put it) with "outstretched desire," put ourselves to death. By throwing up a smoke screen, he obscures the clear words of Christ, "My blood poured out for you for the forgiveness of sins," etc. [Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20]. Their meaning undoubtedly is grasped, received, and retained only by faith, and by no kind of work. This will become clearer as we proceed.

Enough has been said so that you may know that it is of the nature of this spirit to press for a way the reverse of that ordered by God. That which God has made a matter of inward faith and spirit they convert into a human work. But what God has ordained as an outward word and sign and work they convert into an inner spirit. They place the mortification of the flesh prior to faith, even prior to the Word. In devil's fashion they go out where God would enter and enter where he goes out. It ought surprise no one that I call him a devil. For I am not thinking of Dr. Karlstadt or concerned about him. I am thinking of him by whom he is possessed and for whom he speaks, as St. Paul says, "For we are not contending against flesh and blood—but against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" [Eph. 6:12].

So, my brother, cling firmly to the order of God. According to it the putting to death of the old man, wherein we follow the example of Christ, as Peter says [1 Pet. 2:21], does not come first, as this devil urges, but comes last. No one can mortify the flesh, bear the cross, and follow the example of Christ before he is a Christian and has Christ through faith in his heart as an eternal treasure. You don't put the old nature to death, as these prophets do, through works, but through the hearing of the gospel. Before all other works and acts you hear the Word of God, through which the Spirit convinces the world of its sin (John 16[:8]). When we acknowledge our sin, we hear of the grace of Christ. In this Word the Spirit comes and gives

faith where and to whom he wills. Then you proceed to the mortification and the cross and the works of love. Whoever wants to propose to you another order, you can be sure, is of the devil. Such is the spirit of this Karlstadt, as you will more clearly see presently.

So to our task, by the power of God.

First, what a fuss this spirit makes over the word and name, "sacrament." He makes a mountain out of a molehill. I regret to have to answer him. But it is necessary in view of his overbearing attitude. Christ and the apostles, he says, never used the word. He wants a biblical word. God has given names to what he has created. We men should not give names to divine things. At last he becomes a Jew and calls it a "*sekerment*," as the Jews ridicule us Christians, deriving the word from *seker theminith*, that is, a false image. So Hebrew is taught at Naschhausen, *seker* meaning false, and *ment*, an image. Why this parading of words? In order to impress the mad mob who with open mouth and nostrils exclaim, "Believe me, that is something. Here is a learned man. Here is a spirit."

This illustrates what I have said above. Outward names and signs which God has neither commanded nor forbidden, become the main subject on which all stress is laid, just as in the matter of the names of mass and elevation. If you don't speak of sacrament, you are supposed to be spiritual and holy. But whoever uses the word sacrament, he makes black white, and deceives the people about God and perpetrates similar horrible vices. In short, he denies Christ. But is it not a terrible thing for this frivolous spirit to make so much of nothing? Listen, murderer of souls and sinful spirit! We admit that God has not called it a sacrament, nor commanded us to call it a sacrament. But tell me, on your part, where has he forbidden it? Suppose it is only a name. What then? Who has given you the power to forbid what God has not forbidden? What reason is there for your sacrilege in framing up great sins where God has not considered them such? Are you not indeed a murderer of souls who sets himself above us in God's place and takes away our Christian liberty and subordinates consciences to himself?

Indeed you do not use the name employed by Christ and the apostles. Why do you lie so grossly? We also call it the Lord's Supper, or the bread and cup of the Lord, as we read it in the words of the Apostle in 1 Cor. 11[:25]. Yet, stupid spirit, you ought to accuse us, saying, "They forbid us to call it a sacrament and forbid us to speak of it as the Lord's Supper." If you were to pin something like that on us, your bitter poisonous hatred would have something on us. Since we neither command nor forbid anything in this respect, but, in free conscience call it a sacrament, you are the one who denies and blasphemes Christ when entirely on your own, without God's command, you forbid, condemn, and slander a freedom which we have from God, as a gift, and when you make so great and necessary and spiritual a thing out of your external names and signs.

May I not call my Lord Jesus Christ by a name not in Scripture? How about such names as crown of my heart, joy of my heart, my ruby—if I do not make it a matter of conscience, claiming that thus and in no other way is he to be designated? But where do you find these names in Scripture? If we want to speak of baptism and the Lord's Supper collectively, what are we to do? We find no word in Scripture which comprehends all the sacraments or signs. So we must be silent or not speak of them collectively, else these prophets judge us as deniers of Christ. Similarly in regard to the several articles of faith, the various points of Christian doctrine, the various chapters in the Bible. How are we to treat them? These names, articles, points, chapters are not in the Bible. So we are no longer to say anything about articles of the faith,

points of doctrine, chapters of the Bible. What will even these heavenly prophets do, since they refer by name to chapters of the Scriptures? Are not also they murderers of Christ, by their own judgment, since they give names which are not in the Bible to divine things?

We might let it pass if we were dealing with clowns in carnival time. But surely we are not dealing with a good spirit when we find these lofty minds, these heavenly prophets, clowning so childishly in such serious matters and on top of it wanting us to look on these trifles as chief articles of the Christian faith. What light can there be in heads that hold such tangible darkness? I say this in order to expose for you this devil and prove what I have said above. Observe therefore how this rogue institutes ordinances which God has not commanded, and calls spiritual what he has himself contrived. Also, he slanders and deprives us of the Christian freedom which is ours in spirit and conscience. Dear friend, do not lightly regard this prohibition of what God has not forbidden, or the violation of Christian freedom which Christ purchased for us with his blood, or the burdening of conscience with sins that do not exist. Whoever does and dares do this, dares also do any evil. Indeed he denies thereby all that God is, teaches and does, as well as his Christ. So it is no wonder that in the sacrament he wants nothing else than bread and wine, and is the cause of still other disaster. What good can the devil do?

Therefore, my brother, listen to me. You know that for the sake of every article of the Christian faith including that of Christian freedom we ought to be willing to risk body and soul. Therefore do what is prohibited and allow what is commanded by those opposing freedom. Even so St. Paul taught the Galatians [Gal. 5:1ff.]. Since this same Christian freedom is in danger in regard to this word and name, sacrament, you are henceforth obligated to call the Lord's Supper a sacrament, in defiance of these prophets of the devil. And if you are among them or come upon them, you must call it a sacrament, not on account of your own conscience, but in order to confess and maintain Christian freedom. Do not allow the devil to make a commandment, prohibition, sin, or matter of conscience, where God wants none. If you allow them to make this a sin, Christ is no more, they take him away. For with that kind of a conscience we deny the true Christ, who takes away all sin. So you see that though it may seem a small thing there is no small peril when you make these issues a matter of conscience.

It is the same as in regard to the prohibition of meat on a fish day. Eat meat on that day. Don't eat it on a day you are commanded to do so. If you are forbidden to marry, get married, or declare your willingness to do so. So also in other matters. When men want to make commandments, prohibitions, designations of sin, good works, scruples, and perils where God gives freedom and neither commands nor forbids, you must hold firmly to such freedom and always do the contrary until you gain this freedom. Paul would not consent to the circumcision of Titus (Gal. 2[:3]) when others sought to compel him and said it was necessary. Yet he had Timothy circumcised (Acts 16[:3]), when he was under no compulsion. So in this instance you may or may not call it a sacrament. But when these prophets try to force you and forbid you, then you should and must call it a sacrament.

Furthermore, when he goes on to prove that the body and blood of Christ are not in the sacrament, he himself confesses to having been influenced by the traditional statement that the natural body of Christ is as large, broad, thick, and long in the sacrament as it was on the cross. This he says, he cannot believe. This he (as Caiaphas) was compelled by God to say of himself, so that everyone can see that he did not derive his interpretation from but outside of Scripture, and that he wants to bring this kind of notion to Scripture, bending, forcing, and

torturing it according to his own conceit instead of letting his stupid mind be changed and directed by the word and Scripture of God.

But it happens that the populace and reason easily fall for such talk and conceit, and there is really no cause to boast of heavenly voices and lofty minds. Even the most mediocre intellect is inclined thus and would rather believe that only bread and wine were present than that the body and blood of Christ are here concealed. One needs no unusual spirit for that which any one easily believes. All that the stupid populace needs is that some one with a bit of reputation is smart enough to preach this and he has pupils enough. It would not be hard for me to believe and preach such a doctrine, so Dr. Karlstadt need not in this respect boast of much knowledge or skill.

But if we are so to treat our faith that we bring our pet ideas into Scripture and deal with Scripture according to our understanding, attending only to what is common to the crowd and generally accepted notions, then no article of the faith will remain. For there is none in Scripture that God has not placed beyond the reach of reason. On this account, Dr. Karlstadt's error reveals itself in his attitude toward faith and the Word of God, namely that reason readily and willingly accepts it, while in reality reason balks at the Word of God and the articles of faith. And he dares to make this the chief foundation of an article of his own. I too could say that I cannot believe that the Son of God has become man and comprehended a majesty which heaven and earth could not contain in the narrow womb of a woman and then allowed himself to be crucified. And I could then twist and interpret all Scripture and the word of God according to my opinion, as Mani did. So at the very beginning it is sufficiently known that he has brought his pet ideas into Scripture and not drawn them thence, as indeed he cannot derive them thence. He could have kept this method to himself, but God has so ordered it that the cuckoo should call out his own name.

Then he proceeds to Scripture, before which he fears for his life, and seeks to bewitch it so that it will not fell him, saying, "This verse," etc. But while he is mumbling in the dark out of fear, let me set forth his meaning a bit more clearly. He interprets the words in which the Evangelists describe the Lord's Supper in this manner, "Jesus took the bread, gave thanks and broke it and gave to his disciples, saying, take, eat, this is my body which is given for you, do this in remembrance of me."

He says that the words, "this is my body given for you," form an independent sentence and do not belong to the preceding ones, "Take, eat." Their meaning and message is isolated from the rest so that, although they have been added, the passage would be complete without the preceding words.

In short Dr. Karlstadt's contention is that Christ might as well have omitted the words, "This is my body given for you" in the Lord's Supper, and that it would be sufficient to say, "Jesus took the bread, gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to his disciples saying, Take, eat, do this in remembrance of me" [1 Cor. 11:24; Matt. 26:26].

That he has given his body [life] for us, he holds, is mentioned in many other places in Scripture. Here it is introduced superfluously, but to remind them why they should hold him in remembrance. You might almost think that Christ was a drunkard who had indulged so much that night that he became loquacious with his disciples.

How think you? Is not his an irresponsible spirit who so shamelessly deals with God in his word and twists it as he pleases? While these spirits boast that they dare not use a word unless

it is enforced by clear passages of Scripture, and that this must be the procedure, as he constantly urges Gemser in his treatises, saying, show the basis for your argument, cite Scripture, compel, force, pin down, and insist on your interpretation so no one may escape you. But we are willing to accept his own rule and say, dear spirit, you claim two things, first, that the passage "This is my body given for you," is an independent assertion and does not depend on its context. We ask you, don't heed what we see but show us the basis for your argument, cite Scripture, forcing and compelling us to acknowledge your position. How about it? Can you do it? For God's sake, show us at least one syllable which clearly declares or compels us to believe that this passage is an isolated one, and we will believe it. Won't you? Where is your spirit? Where is your God? Is he asleep? [1 Kings 18:27]. Or is he vanquished? Alas, dear children, how silent and speechless the spirit is now who has written so many books and yet cannot adduce one word to prove that this passage stands by itself.

Well then, since the high spirit is silent and can give no evidence, we beg for grace to believe our eyes and ears. We plainly see and hear that this passage is not a kind of unnecessary addition, as this wanton spirit insists, but is a part of the context and is as intimately associated with it as any phrase could be. For it follows immediately on the words, "Take and eat, this is my body," so that no one hearing them in succession would get the idea that they are a new sentence. So there will have to be stronger evidence and more convincing proof from Scripture to persuade us that they are a new independent sentence and do not depend on the preceding words. We may confidently suppose and be sure that his spirit will produce such evidence and proof when the devil becomes God.

For if it were an additional statement it ought not be in the midst of other words nor involved with such as refer to eating. Instead, if the other sentence is complete, the words should follow, and according to Karlstadt the text would read thus: "Take and eat. Do this in remembrance of me. For I say to you that here sits the body which will be given for you."

So Christ would have spoken, if it were an additional sentence and Christ had followed Dr. Karlstadt's opinion. But he is not so loquacious or confused in the head as Dr. Karlstadt, though Dr. Karlstadt thinks that because he himself mixes everything and brews without any order, Christ does the same. But this he should first prove. That he himself has such a mind and method needs no further proof.

In the second place this spirit is under obligation to prove his statement that, "This is my body," is added here in order to teach and remind the disciples why they are to remember Christ. Well, it's out in the open, because the spirit has said so. But where is the basis and proof that Christ for this reason added these words? O Peter of Naschhausen, show your poor companion one little syllable so as to press, force, and compel him so to confess. For he hears well enough what you say, but it is a great shame that you have forgotten that you must prove it. Where is it written? What passage in Scripture says that these words were added to give instructions about remembrance? I know that we are to remember the death of Christ. But that these words were added for this purpose I don't know, namely, that the Supper is complete without this sentence, and plenty of other passages indicate why we should remember Christ. Had I been with you, Peter, I would have introduced you to another kind of Gemser who would have set the ruffian straight.

This then is the situation. Is Dr. Karlstadt one who has power to define articles of faith, so that we must believe him, even when he speaks without scriptural foundation about what he

dreams? Then what he writes is correct, and this passage must be forced out of its context. It has only a special meaning which has been added and patched on the whole text in the manner of a sea shell fastened to a pilgrim's cape, and has nothing to do with the Supper. But if he is not the one, then you see how the devil rides him, so that he tears, establishes, alters, interprets, and tortures the Word of God according to his whim and fancy, in view of which I almost believe proof that the man is not in earnest. It seems he is an opportunist who cares for neither God nor man. For how could a man without guidance of a particular devil undertake to close eyes and ears to a crystal-clear word, and to speak without authority of Scripture, and set up whatever opinion he desires. He exalts such idiosyncrasy as if nothing more firm were to be found on earth, and he slanders and insults those who oppose him, as if he were possessed by devils. This is clearly seen in his books.

His tearing and torturing of God's Word reminds me of an author whose book I read as a young Master of Arts. He twisted and tortured the Lord's Prayer thus: Our Father, hallowed be Thou in heaven, Thy name come, Thy kingdom be done, etc. The subdivisions were strange and rare, and reasons for doing so were not lacking. It also reminds me of the way some Jews have treated Gen. 2 [1:27]: "God created man in his own image; male and female he created them." This they interpret to mean that God created Adam in such a way as to include both a male and female image. If such cutting and dividing were valid, especially in passages of importance, and such as are the basis of articles of faith, what a fine Bible we would have. In other passages it may not be so important.

This then is our basis. Where Holy Scripture is the ground of faith we are not to deviate from the words as they stand nor from the order in which they stand, unless an express article of faith compels a different interpretation or order. For else what would happen to the Bible? For instance, when the Psalmist says, "God is my rock" [Ps. 18:3], he uses a word which otherwise refers to a natural stone. But inasmuch as my faith teaches me that God is not a natural stone, I am compelled to give the word "stone," in this place, another meaning than the natural one. So also in Matt. 16[:18], "On this rock I will build my church." In the passage we now are treating no article of faith compels us to sever it and remove it from its place, or to hold that the bread is not the body of Christ. Therefore we must take the words just as they stand, making no change and letting the bread be the body of Christ.

But, says my Peter Rültz, it is a special sentence, because the phrase, "This is my body," begins with a capital letter, and it is preceded by a period which usually indicates the beginning of a new passage.[120] What do I hear? I demanded a reason and basis in Scripture, and you give me a period and capital letter. Is a period and a capital letter Holy Scripture in the mind of the Naschhausen plowman? Indeed I hear you give me your peculiar notion in place of divine Scripture and return dirt for gold. Because you have the opinion that a period and capital letter indicate something different and new, you want to talk me into thinking the same without scriptural authority. Peculiar notions and crying Scripture, Scripture, Scripture, compel, urge, force me by a word of God, will not prove that a period and capital letter introduce something new. Where in Scripture do you find a clear assertion that a period and a capital letter mark the beginning of an independent statement? Don't you hear, Peter? Peter, do you hear?

Is it not a sin and shame that this spirit seeks to base so important a matter on such idle prattle yet makes so terrible a racket if we do not give a scriptural basis? Suppose my book had no periods or capitals and yours had both. Our faith might come to depend on ink and pen, and

even on the disposition of writer and printer. That would be a fine foundation! To put it briefly, we must have sober, lucid words and texts which by reason of their clarity are convincing, regardless of whether they are written with capital or small letters, with or without punctuation. For even if it were true (which it is not) that a period and capital indicated something new, should it follow in regard to Holy Scripture that my faith should rest not on expressions and words alone but on frail periods and capitals which really say or sing nothing. That would indeed be a false foundation.

How about the use in some books (not all are alike) of capital letters and punctuation marks to indicate the importance of what is said, so that the reader will the better observe and remember it, rather than that something new is signified? On what doubts my faith would then be founded if it were claimed that period and capital introduced something new? How often do we consistently spell the name Christ with a capital letter? How often do we underline or draw a hand or some figure alongside the text, though it is not a question of something new. Punctuation marks and letters are a human invention and means and man has full freedom to put them wherever he wills. My Dr. Karlstadt wants to establish a divine faith and word on such changing human conventions.

Alas, what can one say? The spirit can hardly mean it. It is clear that he is concerned only about self-contrived matters and not much about faith and God's Word. Woe to a faith which, compelled to seek support and aid from such scraps, is not grounded on any word from the great and wide Scriptures, where all articles otherwise have a substantial and solid base. Even if Dr. Karlstadt's opinion were correct and true, I ought and could not believe it, because of his tomfoolery with points and capitals. He produces no part of the Word and does nothing more than deny our clear, forthright, ordered text. I cannot but think, "O my, this is foolishness and gives me no foundation."

Herewith I address myself to all who accept the opinion of Dr. Karlstadt. I say that Dr. Karlstadt's sole and best argument rests on the passage, "This is my body," as a separate text, as a beginning of a new and additional sentence, as we have heard. If he cannot prove or explain this, his whole case falls. He has nothing more than his *touto*, and such like, and everything depends on its being a new and separate sentence. If this falls and our contention stands, that this part is connected with the other, Karlstadt is helped neither by *touto* nor *tatta*, and we have won. The context forcibly urges and compels us to accept the meaning that the bread is the body of Christ. Since the words read, "Take, eat, this is my body," and are dependent on each other, they compel us forcibly to hold that what he asks them to eat is his body. Dr. Karlstadt himself recognized this and therefore was so anxious to tear and divide the words from each other. But he found only a period and a capital, and even they are not in all books. Even if they were, it would be uncertain whether they were there as an introduction of a new thought or for the sake of the reader's devotion, and the latter is the more likely.

But faith should and must rest on certainty not on punctuation marks and capitals. It must have clear, distinct passages and altogether plain words out of Scripture as its foundation. There now, you Karlstadtians and as many as there may be of you, you all lie in one heap. Your faith rests on frail, uncertain points and letters. That Belial may wager his conscience and salvation on such, not I. My dear Karlstadtian sirs, you write many books, but for God's sake give attention to the point where you are in trouble and consider how you may prove the passage "This is my body," to be the beginning of a new thought. Everything depends on this,

this is the focal point, dear brother, whether you sever, divide, or separate. Even if you write as many books as there is sand on the seashore, if you cannot prove this point, you have lost. As I have said and repeat once more, the text combines, “Take, eat, this is my body.” If you let the word “eat” remain with “body of Christ,” you must meet the argument that the bread is the body, and it is the body that is to be eaten. This you cannot escape. I dare you and I dare you twice over.

Tell me how you can depend on a spirit who dares gamble on so priceless a truth without the authority of Word and Scripture, solely on the basis of a single period and a capital letter. Is he not sufficiently foolhardy and foolish? Do you think he has a conscience? What more would he not venture if he had opportunity? What devout heart would entrust him with anything that is good or upright? All right, I have done my duty. Whoever wants to fall into error, let it be his lot. And though this is sufficient answer to all of Karlstadt’s books, since it is established that the bread is the body of Christ, he ought to learn to tone down his shameful insults by calling us dogcatchers and heaping abuse on us. He has fought against us with his period and capital as his one wretched weapon, as one would attack a cliff with a broken straw. It serves him right. Why did he not stay away from his prophets?

Yet I am willing to give further answer, in order to reinforce my position. To begin With, if he should demand that I should also prove my faith that this sentence, “This is my body,” belongs to the preceding words, whereas he denies it and cannot prove that the one passage is separable from the other, I would reply thus: I let the one stand with the other as I find them in the text because in speaking, hearing, and reading the one naturally follows the other and I know no reason why I may or should separate the natural order and sequence of the words. Since I find them connected, the burden of proof lies on him who would separate them. This is sufficient confirmation for me. Just as I take the words of “The Lord’s Prayer” as they stand, “Our Father who art in heaven.” I need no further confirmation than that this is the order of the words. I know no reason why I should divide thus “Our Father who art, in heaven hallowed be,” etc. If you so divide I want to know the reason and offer objection. So here the natural manner of speaking is, “Take, eat, this is my body.” One word follows the other, and I know no reason for separating them. For Karlstadt’s period and capital mean nothing, and neither he nor any one else has another reason. For good measure, we shall go on to show from the clear message and meaning of Scripture, not from punctuation or capitals, that the one word should and must follow the other. For the present, let this be answer enough to the objection of the devil.

In the third place he comes with his Greek and chokes at the *touto*. For in Greek the sentence reads, “*Touto esti to soma mou*.” Originally and still today these Greek words mean in translation, “this is my body.” In Latin the words, “*Hoc est corpus meum*,” are a complete and correct rendering of the Greek, without missing the point by one whit, as all those would have to affirm, who know Greek. Peter Rültz of Orlamünde alone has discovered something new. Pretending that one cannot adequately translate the whole phrase, he thinks it would be well to let *touto* remain untranslated, and we read “*touto* is my body.” What can I say? I would laugh at the monkey business if it did not concern matters of such great importance. The ass’s head wants to master Greek, and knows neither German nor Latin, let alone Greek and Hebrew. He presents himself unashamedly before the whole world as if there were only Peter Rültz of Naschhausen here who does know Greek.

Now this rebel spirit only intends to rouse the evil mob and draw it to himself, for always it desires the unusual and what is new. They will smack their lips and exclaim, "What a wonderful man this Dr. Karlstadt is. He discovers what is concealed from all the world, yet, in his humility wears the gray coat and felt hat of a peasant, and does not want to be called Doctor but neighbor Andrew." Here God dwells and the Holy Spirit with all his feathers and eggs. Karlstadt certainly does not appeal to the crowd because they understand his reasoning. This they cannot do, for he mumbles, strains himself to the breaking point, and chokes on his words and can hardly express what he wants to say. Perchance God resists him, or he simply lacks the ability to speak German. I know that no one of them can tell what his reasoning is, even though one had consumed all his books. On the other hand, they fall for him because of his great cleverness and big words and because he calmly blasphemes in suggesting how contrary to reason it is to believe that the body of Christ is in the sacrament. In this way he can arouse and make a fool of the crowd. That he knows nothing about the foundation of faith doesn't much matter. But this thing doesn't last.

I have two tasks in hand. First, I must more clearly expose Dr. Karlstadt's basis and reasoning; secondly, I must give my answer. Now with regard to Dr. Karlstadt's dream about his *touto*, this needs be said. The German, Latin and Greek languages employ three genders in their pronouns: masculine, where we in German use *der, dieser, jener;* feminine, where we use *die, diese, jene;* and neuter where we use *das, dies, jenes*. So we say *der Himmel* (the heaven), *der Mond* (the moon), *der Stern* (the star), *der Mann* (the man), *der Knabe* (the boy), *der Hund* (the dog). So also *die Sonne* (the sun), *die Erde* (the earth), *die Luft* (the air), *die Stadt* (the city), *die Frau* (the woman), *die Magd* (the maid), *die Kuh* (the cow). Also, *das Wasser* (the water), *das Holz* (the wood), *das Feuer* (the fire), *das Licht* (the light), *das Pferd* (the horse), *das Schwein* (the pig). But the Hebrew language does not have these genders, only the masculine and feminine *der* and *die*.

Now Karlstadt contends thus. In the Greek and Latin languages bread is preceded by *der*, not *das*. For they say *der artos, der panis*. We Germans, however, say *das Brot*. Body, however, is *das* in Greek and Latin. For they say, *das soma, das corpus*. We Germans say, *der Leib*. Since Christ here says, "*Touto esti to soma mou*," "*Das ist mein Leib*," and does not say, "*Der ist mein Leib*," he cannot be referring to bread, which would be *der* in Greek, but to his body, which is *das* in Greek. Do you now understand what Dr. Karlstadt is after? It is his Greek *touto*, which in German is *das*. As a modern Greek he wants to contend from the Greek language that the body of Christ is not in the sacrament, for Christ does not say, "*Der ist mein Leib*," but, "*Das ist mein Leib*." To speak of bread as "*Das ist mein Leib*," is not in keeping with Greek grammar.

Such skill no Greek ever witnessed, from Christ's time to ours, even if he were a native in the language. But now they have discovered this skill at Orlamünde, perhaps in an ancient image when they destroyed the images, or they have it from some heavenly voice. And the man who has hardly seen "a-b-c" in Greek, gives no credit to those born and bred in the language, or to those who now in Germany and other lands have competent knowledge of Greek. Since nothing is easier than to sense and observe a discrepancy of this kind, surely they would have done so in all this time. For there is no child reared in the German language, who would not laugh if someone said to him about a woman, "*Der Frau ist schön*" (the woman—masculine—is beautiful), "*Das Mann ist fromm*" (the man—neuter—is devout), and would say that you are a Tartar or a gypsy. Would not all Greece and the whole world have sensed the same, if Christ

had said, "*Touto* is my body," though all the world knows that *touto* has been and still is understood as referring to "bread"! If a Greek child heard some one say, *das artos* (the—neuter—bread) he too would soon laugh. Yet no one has laughed when all the world has said of the bread, "*Das ist mein Leib*" (this is my body).

Yet this stupid spirit presumes now to instruct the Greeks. But as I have said, the man has lost head, eyes, brain, and heart, since he knows neither shame nor fear, and dares wager all according to his whims. He knows well enough that he is ignorant of Greek, and proves it fully by translating the Greek, "*Touto esti to soma mou*," into Latin "*Istud panis est hoc corpus meum*," and into German, "*Touto ist der Leib mein*," making of the article *to* a pronoun and inserting *panis*, etc. What German speaks thus: "This is the body, mine?" Yet on such ignorance he consciously ventures to build a faith for himself and all the world. If some one dares build articles of faith on conscious and admitted ignorance and so to teach the world, how much more he would dare do it on a vague illusion or doubt? Indeed, what would such an impudent spirit not dare? I am terror-stricken at the boldness and outrage of men in divine things, while in their attitudes to men on earth they are weak, unstable, and despairing.

Let me now explain why Christ said *touto* or *das* of the bread instead of *der*. In German we have a way of speaking which allows us when we point to something before us to designate and call it *das*, whether in itself it be *der* or *die*. So I say, "*Das ist der Mann* (that is the man) of whom I speak," "*Das ist die Jungfrau* (that is the young lady) whom I mean," "*Das ist die Magd* (that is the maiden) who sang there," "*Das ist der Geselle* (that is the fellow) who told me," "*Das ist die Stadt* (that is the city) that did it," "*Das ist der Thurm* (that is the tower) that lies there," "*Das ist der Fisch* (that is the fish) which I brought." Here I call to witness all Germans, if I am speaking German. After all, this is our mother tongue, and we commonly speak so in German lands.

The Greeks do the same in their language in regard to *touto* and the bread, when they point to it and say, "That is my body, given for you." I call to witness all those who know Greek. But the Latin language is different—it has no [definite and indefinite] articles as do the Greek and German. Especially is it so among my Saxons who "*tutten*" and "*tatten*" just like the Greeks, with whom they are in complete agreement in saying, "*Touto esti to soma mou*," this is your body, this is the woman, this is my body. Were Dr. Karlstadt's dream to prevail, one would have to claim that it would not be German to say, "*Das ist mein Leib*" (this is my body) given for you, since *Leib* (body) requires *der* in German. Though we say, "*der Leib* (the body) is large," yet we say, "*Das ist der Leib*" (this is the body) that pleases me. So also, "*Das ist der Leib*" (this is the body) given for you. But Dr. Karlstadt thus reveals that he knows no more German than Greek.

In the sacrament, thus, when I speak German and have a wafer or host before me in my hand, though both would require "*die*," I say, "*Das ist die Speise*" (this is the food), and not, "*Die ist die Speise*." So also Christ said of the same wafer or host, "This is my body," etc. You ask, why I cannot say *das Man* and yet say *Das ist der Mann*. I cannot say: *das Frau, das Magd, das Stadt, das Geselle* and yet I have to say; "*Das ist die Frau*," "*Das ist die Magd*," "*Das ist die Stadt*," "*Das ist der Geselle*." I know no other reason than that this is the genius of languages as God has created them. Thus no Greek will say "*das artos*" and yet he will say "*Das ist der artos*." So also he says, "This is my body, given for you."

Again, dear Peter Rültz, Gemser wants to try to open your ears. You say *touto* refers to the body of Christ and not to the bread, when Christ says *touto*, or, this is my body. Tell me, dear

Peter, to what then does the other *touto* which follows refer? Luke 22[:20] and Paul in 1 Cor. 11[:22] speak thus of the second part of the sacrament: "In the same way he took the cup, after supper, and said, *touto*, or this cup is the new testament in my blood," etc. Here the word *touto* is clearly expressed in the text and refers to the cup, which he offered, and not to the blood of Christ contained therein. For in Greek it reads, "*Touto to poterion he kaine diatheke estin en to haimati mou*" (this cup is the new testament in my blood). Tell me, if the *touto* must refer to Christ and yet here in the text it expressly refers to the cup, do you believe and call the blood of Christ or Christ himself, the cup? Would it not be better if you made all your ideas completely new and did not call his blood a cup, but a dinner basket or a spoonbowl?

Do you hear, Peter? Why do you sweat so? It is winter and freezing weather. Do you want a handkerchief? Won't a capital letter or period help here? Or will not the *touto* become a *das* and the cup a *der*, so that grammar might come to your aid when the spirit fails! For "cup" in Greek is also a *das* and not a *der*, *touto poterion*. Are you not the man who loves the straight truth? And who boasts that he is bold in the face of lies but yielding before the truth? Well, yield now and listen. Acknowledge the truth and confess that you have been mistaken about the *touto*, and that the one who came and told you was not your heavenly Father, as you lied and blasphemed, but the harassing devil or his mother, who pointed you to the *touto* referring to the bread but said nothing about the one referring to the cup.

What can you mumble against this, the whole bunch of you Karlstadtians? You have nothing to say, but to condemn your blasphemous treatise and lying tongue. As those who have been publicly and irrefutably vanquished, confess that just as the *touto* in connection with the cup does not refer to the seated Christ but to the cup and his blood, which Christ offered to the disciples, bidding them drink and saying that this was a new testament in his blood, so also you must confess that the *touto* in connection with the bread referred not to the body of Christ but to the bread that he gave them and told them to eat. Do you object to this? Let us hear. Behold how God can catch the wise in their craftiness [Cf. 1 Cor. 3:19; Job 5:13]. For these prophets thought they could overturn the world with their *touto* in connection with the bread, but overlooked that the *touto* with the cup immediately plunged them into the mire so that they could not as much as give forth a peep.

Is this man not plagued by misfortune? The Evangelists have placed *touto* at this point to make certain it would be understood to refer to the bread and have spoken most simply to avoid the error that Dr. Karlstadt pursues. But he grasps for it and arrogates it to himself to fortify his error. Tell me, now, Peter Rültz, who has the sword by its edge and who by its hilt? I think you have been struck and your companion has thrust you with your own *touto*, with which you thought you were doing valiantly. You ought clearly to see which of us two has the spirit and the right skill. If I were to repay you in slanderous words for the way you have blasphemed so maliciously and terribly the exalted sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, where would I find enough words? For your sins and blasphemy are immeasurable.

Even if, in spite of everything, Dr. Karlstadt remained unshaken with his *touto*, and it were as he fancies, yet I have already proved that it would not help him, since he has not achieved and cannot achieve that the phrase, "This is my body," is something new and separated from the rest of the passage. When my poor factious spirit finds himself in straits, he wants to get out. For if it is not an independent passage, but dependent on the other part, everything is swept away which Dr. Karlstadt "*toutos* or *tautas*, clucks or cackles." Firmly and defiantly, the

truth remains that the body of Christ is in the sacrament. If that stands, the Holy Spirit also has the power to say, *der Magd* and *das Mann*; it is of no consequence, neither does it help or hurt if he says, *der Brot* or *das Brot*. Not that He does so here, but even if He had done so, Dr. Karlstadt would have gained nothing. Something higher than rules of grammar must always be present when the grounding of faith is concerned. For even John in Chapter 1[:10] of his Gospel speaks of light and calls it *das*, but shortly afterwards uses *der* and says, "The world knew him not," rather than, "The world knew it not." So Dr. Karlstadt fares ridiculously not only in his knowledge of Greek but in that he tries to ground articles of faith on grammar. If my faith had to rest on Donatus or A-B-C books, I would be in a bad way.

How many new articles we would have to establish, if we were to master the Bible in all passages according to grammatical rules? How often it speaks contrary to custom in regard to number, gender, person, etc. Indeed, what language does not do so? We Germans use *die* before *Nacht* (night) and say *die Nacht*. Yet at times we change the *die* to *das* and speak of *des Nachts*. "*Es ist des Nachts still und gut schlafen*" ("It is still at night and good to sleep"). So Dr. Karlstadt had better have stayed at home with his grammar. He could have produced words and text more fittingly from Scripture so as to win us over to his *touto* as a reference to the person of Christ instead of the bread. He asks us to produce passages from Scripture. So we require him to do the same. All right, tackle the task briskly, Peter. Show us one syllable from Scripture that *touto* applies to the person of Christ and not to the bread. Why not? We don't believe your grammar, for its foundation is sandy and uncertain.

So you see, my dear reader, how this *touto* matter stands. Dr. Karlstadt obstinately denies that it refers to the bread, saying it is not clearly and certainly proved. So he holds to his position, which shows a purely malicious objection to the natural meaning and order of the language. He has to be convinced that it refers to the bread. Though the nature of speech supports us, yet we have for good measure and overwhelmingly proved from the text that it must refer to bread since in the following part it refers to the cup. Consequently his mouth has been stopped.

So we, on our side, hold to our "no" and demand that he prove how the *touto* refers to the body of Christ, as he says and affirms. For whoever affirms must prove his assertion against him who denies. Despite objection let him produce a text for his affirmation, as we have done for ours. That he says "no" to what we affirm, despite the nature of language, and affirms what we deny, means nothing. He must refute our "no" with a clear biblical text and prove his assertions, just as we have refuted with a clear text what he denies and have established our assertion. If he overcomes our objection, he will have won. We pray, however, for his mercy and ask that he doesn't burn the marsh.

But it is as I said. The spirit does not take important matters seriously. The devil merely finds an opportunity to pursue his game and hold the whole business up to ridicule. All right, I will turn over Dr. Karlstadt with his grovelling Greek to those competent in it who can knock the nonsense out of his head and whip him soundly, so that another time he does not presume to use Greek before he knows it. I will deal with him, using Scripture, and demand that he use Scripture. If he will do that he will become a knight with his *touto*. I hope, however, that we will at least be spared from him this Shrovetide, by God's help. Let this be said of the dear *touto* about which the heavenly prophets have made such an ado.

Let us now take the text and see how fine it would turn out if this passage, “This is my body,” were a separate phrase and referred to the person of Christ, and not to the bread. For as Christ took the bread in his hand, gave thanks, and broke it, giving to his disciples and saying, “Take and eat,” and immediately went on without transition, “This is my body,” the meaning and natural order of the words compel us to conclude that he speaks of the bread which he took in his hand and gave and told them to eat of it. Otherwise the disciples could not have understood him nor could any one else who heard him say it. For their eyes must have turned to his hand as he took the bread, broke it, gave and distributed it, and their ears must have heard the words which he spoke while he offered and gave it to them. For in the administration he only spoke the words, “This is my body.”

Were it not his body which he offered and told them to eat, as he said, “Eat, this is my body,” he would have deceived them and mocked them with words. How would it sound if I gave someone a gray coat, saying, “Here, put this on, this is my white cape trimmed with martin,” etc., and applied the words to the garment I have on? Would that not be deceit and mockery if after I had said, “Here, put this on,” I immediately went on without a break to say, “This is my white cape trimmed with martin”? Of course, there must be words of transition which would turn his attention from the gray coat I offer him and tell him to put on my cape. Otherwise he would not be able to understand. And how would it sound if I gave someone a piece of bread and said, “Take and eat,” and as I offered and asked him to eat it, I immediately went on to say, “This is a pound of gold in my pocket”?

Truly it must not be a *touto* or *tauta* or period or capital that comes between, to indicate the beginning of a different and new meaning, for the words follow each other too closely. Clearly expressed words must be interposed to separate the parts, as, “Take, eat, for I have, or there is still, a pound of gold in my pocket.” Or, “Here, put this on, I still have, or there is still, another white cape with martin trim.” So here Christ would have had to say, “Take, eat, for I tell you here my body is seated, which will be given for you.” Otherwise it would be mocking and ridiculous. As if one were to hand a drink to another and would say, “Take, drink, here I sit, Hans in the red pants,” or “Here, drink, the Turks have slain the Sultan,” or otherwise bring in an alien notion that has nothing to do with drinking. So it would be if Christ said “Take, eat, this is my body, given for you,” and were introducing a new thought.

If he had not said these words just in the same moment as he offered the bread, but a little before or after, there might have seemed to be some argument. But now that he said, “This is my body,” just as he gave and offered to them the bread and bade them eat, no one can draw any other conclusion from the meaning of words than that it was his body which he offered and asked them to eat. Or else it must be admitted that no one can be sure about what one says to another. If any one so tears apart these clear and distinct words, let no one hereafter speak with me without knowing I may interpret his words differently, or I must be concerned that he will misinterpret my words. Why should Christ have to say such a word in the moment that he offered them bread and bade them eat, when he had plenty of other occasions to say it and well knew that they would not apply it except to the bread which he gave them and asked them to eat.

It is not true, therefore, as Dr. Karlstadt claims, that he spoke so as to teach them wherein the remembrance should consist. This he said boldly from his own imagination and cannot prove it by Scripture or otherwise. One does not teach by abruptly, suddenly, and deceivingly

breaking off a thought and, without warning and notice going on to another matter, while offering something of which he is not speaking. In so doing one obscures, deceives, and deludes. In teaching one must proceed with simplicity, plainness, and clarity, even showing what one teaches, and not giving or showing one thing while teaching or referring to something else. It is not good teaching to show you white while teaching you about black, or to show you the devil while teaching you about God. Clowns and deceivers or scoffers and jesters do so either to mislead or to ridicule. A devout man who is in earnest does not do so.

Or why was it necessary for Christ to point twice to himself—once toward his body, once toward his blood? Had it not been enough if he had said, "I am he," or, "This is my body, of which the prophets have said that it will be given for you," as Dr. Karlstadt wants it? Now, however, everything points toward eating and drinking and both are expressed. He takes something hard, similar to the bread, namely his body, and something liquid, similar to what they drink, namely his blood. Why did he have to do that? He could just as well have taken something else, not as similar to bread and wine. As we said, he could simply have asserted, "I am the man who is given for you," and there would have been no reference to anything that could be eaten or drunk.

Now that he gives both, the one in the bread in the form that is eaten, and the one in wine in a form that is drunk, and only does it at the time they are at the table eating, and even in the moment that he offers it and asks them to eat and drink, no conscience denying this can ever be certain. And I am sure that even Dr. Karlstadt's conscience is uneasy and uncertain so as to render it unable to digest such blows, however hardened and blinded he may be. For Christ could have taught this at some other time and not saved it up until they ate and drank, and until he offered it to them and told them to eat and drink.

What does it mean? When he had given the bread and said, "This is my body," etc., he begins anew with the cup and this time gives the wine and says, "This is my blood." If he begins something new when he says, "This is my body," wanting thereby to teach on what the remembrance was based, he would not have separated and divided the one part from the other, but would have combined body and blood closely with one another and said, "This is my body and blood, which is given for you and shed for you," and then the teaching could be considered clear and complete. But now that he separates, and says one word about eating and another about drinking, and inserts other words between the two, namely, "Likewise he took the cup, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying drink ye all of this," one certainly can conclude that the eating and drinking is of concern to the Lord, as he says, "This is my body, this is my blood."

See, indeed, how neatly this spirit soils himself with his cleverness. He pretends that the passage, "This is my body given for you," does not belong to what immediately precedes, namely, "Take, eat," but is to be considered a new, independent, sentence. Yet he admits, and must admit, that this last passage, "This do in remembrance of me," belongs to the first words, "Take, eat." Is it not obstinate mischief, when in a passage three parts follow each other and are related to each other, some one dares claim that the first and last belong together, but that the second and middle part is independent and belongs to neither, and does this on his own initiative without any basis in Scripture? How can a mind tolerate that the third or last should belong to the first, and the second or middle part between the two belong to neither of them?

It would be the same as saying that in this passage, “Jesus said to his disciples, beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep’s clothing” [Matt. 7:15], the middle part, “Beware of false prophets,” did not belong to the first or last part, but was a new, independent, sentence. The text then would read, “Jesus said to his disciples, who come to you in sheep’s clothing, for you should beware of false prophets.” A shameless obstinacy might say so, but no one is so mad as to believe him. Just so is it with this shameless spirit who raves in this place, when he sees that the passage, “This is my body,” follows immediately upon the first, without so much as an “and” between them, and that the sense requires that the two belong together.

But Dr. Karlstadt patches things over with an interpolation, saying, “It is as if Christ were to say, ‘Dear disciples, you have heard that the prophets speak of a body, which should be given for sins. I say to you, I am that body,’ ” etc. My answer is, Who has said so? Who has authorized him to make an interpolation here? How do we know that this interpolation and addition are correct? Where is the Scripture and basis for it? How does the text require it? Indeed where is there a single syllable in support of it? Karlstadt says so. If this is enough, then it is much more sufficient that I say otherwise, for I have the clear text and natural meaning of the words on my side. Was Christ inferior to Dr. Karlstadt in wisdom, in that he did not add this himself, when it was so highly necessary to have this meaning here? Where are now the lofty prophets, who do not call the Lord’s Supper a sacrament, but wanted a name from the Bible? They will not even tolerate the word *enim*. Tell me, now, what sense does it make to decry the addition of a little word or name (which imperils nothing), as the greatest of all vices, while the addition of a lot of loose talk and an interpolation which ruins everything is permissible? Don’t you see the devil in this again who makes that which is nothing and optional a matter of necessity and makes nothing of the Word of God which is of supreme importance? But that is his nature throughout.

Good God! though we have such clear and certain passages of Scripture, it is still trouble and toil to remain ahead of the devil. And this lying spirit would have us depend on his own word, so that we would need have no other support than to say, Dr. Karlstadt said so. What fine shape we would then be in? Is this to bring the people to Christ? Indeed to the devil in the depths of hell. I think I know what he had in mind. He imagined, forsooth, the rascal spirit, “They will come at me with these clear Scripture passages, and what shall I do? By anticipating their plans, I shall render their verses weak and blunt their edges by my own interpolations.” But the mad fool did not realize that by weakening and making blunt the edges of our clear passages of Scripture with his own interpolations without Scripture would accomplish nothing, other than to make the edges sharper. For when people see that he has no scriptural basis and only comes with his own self-contrived interpolation, they sense that he himself must have felt the text was too clear and overpowering for him. So his lying is on a par with his doubtful confession, and his patchwork as poor as a double tear. But, my lying spirit, you can’t patch things that way. You must lead with Scripture and text.

Secondly, I would very much like to hear a text from the prophets which speaks of a body and blood which are to be given for sins, as this lying spirit pretends. They say, of course, of the whole person that he must suffer, but nothing of body and blood. Since Christ here clearly names body and blood and refers to the prophets, as this spirit says, the words “body and blood” should be found somewhere in the prophets and should be identical with Christ, who would be reminding the disciples of them and they would understand him. Now, you lying spirit, who suffers not that a word be added to God’s Word, show us where the prophets speak

of a body or blood? Where in the prophets had the disciples heard it? Again you see that with this spirit everything is forced and feigned? The whole Christ must suffer, but at the table he makes a division so as to give his body to be eaten, and his blood to be drunk. Such a separation was not necessary nor could it take place in his suffering. Consequently the prophets have spoken of suffering and not of this division or of the Supper.

Thirdly, if we are to make so extensive an addition, how will this fit in with what follows thereupon, "This do in remembrance of me"? For it should connect with "eat" in his saying, "Take, eat." Shall it jump back over so many words and so long a statement to that with which it belongs? Where is the language whose nature and character permits interposing so many other words and so long a statement between two words that belong together. Quite obviously we are dealing with mischievous wantonness. Still, as we have said, Karlstadt must produce the proof for his contentions which we shall await.

Let this be our answer to the arguments and reasons that Dr. Karlstadt presents for his dream from Scripture. They were threefold. First, a capital letter is found in some books, not all. Second, there was a punctuation mark. Third, the dear *touto*. What wonderful arguments, which no one would use except such heavenly prophets, who hear the voice of God. A fourth now is, that he cannot present a single verse of Scripture in his favor. This is the most damaging argument and will forever remain so. I shall not overthrow it but will rather strengthen it. Furthermore he teaches us what Frau Hulda, natural reason, has to say in the matter, just as if we did not know that reason is the devil's prostitute and can do nothing else but slander and dishonor what God does and says. But before we answer this arch-prostitute and devil's bride, we first want to prove our faith, not by setting forth capitals or periods or *touto tauta* but by clear, sober passages from Scripture which the devil will not overthrow.

In the first place no one can deny that the three Evangelists, Matthew [26:26]; Mark [14:22], and Luke [22:19], and Paul in 1 Cor. [11:24] agree in their descriptions of the first part of the sacrament and use almost identical words. Christ took the bread, gave thanks, broke it, and gave to his disciples, saying, "Take and eat, this is my body, given for you." Since they all speak of the same thing, our understanding of the Evangelist Matthew's report must agree with that of the Evangelists Mark and Luke, and that of Paul. Is it not surely this, in spite of what else could be said? It is certain that the meaning of all four is that Christ did not here bid the disciples to dance or pipe a tune, but to eat, according to the words, "Take, eat, this is my body," etc.

So then it must be admitted, without danger of contradiction, that the same four, in describing the second part of the sacrament, also are in agreement and in their narrative all have sought to speak of the same event. This despite of what else could be said here also. So what Matthew [26:28] says, "This is the blood of the new testament, which is poured out for many, for the forgiveness of sins," must be the same and mean the same as when Mark [14:24] says, "This is the blood of the new testament, which is poured out for many." So also, when Luke [22:20] and Paul [1 Cor. 11:25] say, "This is the cup of the new testament in my blood, which is poured out for you," it is and means the same as Matthew and Mark seek to say in these words, "This is my blood, poured out for many." Who can still here say or think otherwise? With the words, "This is the cup," Luke and Paul do not refer to the visible body or the visible blood of Christ, but to the visible cup, as the word forcefully requires since it clearly stands there and says, "This is the cup." Therefore the body or blood of Christ is neither cup nor

jug, neither dish nor plate. We must likewise conclude that Matthew and Mark speak of the same visible cup and not of the visible blood of Christ when they say, "This is my blood." Thus the word *das* in all the gospels never does or can refer or point to anything else than what Christ offered, namely, the cup or the drink, when he asked them to drink. Or else we must say that the Evangelists were not in agreement and were not writing of the same thing in the second part of the sacrament.

So now enough for this time. As stated above, Karlstadt's *touto* and *tauta* are lost. It is established that the Evangelists and Paul do not speak of the visible blood of Christ but of the cup or the wine, and it must be conceded that they say, "This is my blood of the new testament." Also, "This is the cup of the new testament in my blood." If we have maintained that in the sacrament the blood of Christ is truly present as these words require, then it is likewise confirmed that also the body of Christ is truly present in the other part of the sacrament. Thus all of Dr. Karlstadt's objections have fallen to the ground, and it is clear that they were nothing but his own dream, which with utter carelessness he hoped to inject into Scripture, but which now is excluded.

He reviles us with many scornful and jeering words, asking how we get Christ into the bread and wine, whether He must strike up the tune we demand and many similar words of shameful blasphemy. We can plainly see that they are the words of a thoughtless spirit or devil, which serve to excite the profligate mob and charm those who are not much worried about faith and conscience. But sincere hearts who are concerned about conscience and faith are surely not satisfied with such jesting and words of abuse and sacrilege. They want the Word of God and say, "Why should I care for Karlstadt's dreams, sneers, and slanders? I see the clear, distinct, and powerful words of God which compel me to confess, that the body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament." Such should be our answer, and ridicule we can meanwhile disregard. How Christ is brought into the bread or strikes up the tune we demand, I do not know. But I do know full well that the Word of God cannot lie, and it says that the body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament.

Here I will not yet answer the sophistic and miserable interpolation with which Dr. Karlstadt mends and patches the words about the cup. He must bite sharper who would make any dent in this text. Karlstadt's words will not do it, they are only Karlstadtian. Later I will show up his sophistry. For the present, it is sufficient to have proven in powerful fashion that the Evangelists and Paul refer the words, "This is my body," "This is my blood," "This is the cup," not to the visible body or blood of Christ, as Karlstadt dreams, but to that which he offers the disciples, bidding them eat and drink. This passage we have won and secured beyond the power of Karlstadt and all devils with their sophistry, of that I am sure. But, as I have said, it is the nature of this spirit to pay no attention to the external Word and sign of God. This he attacks boldly and does with it as he pleases. Then he devises something sheerly out of his own imagination, without any basis in Scripture, and this is supposed to be the true spirit.

Furthermore beside these four strong passages we have yet another. 1 Cor. 10[:16] reads thus: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?" That is a verse which is a thunderbolt on the head of Dr. Karlstadt and his whole party. This verse has been also the life-giving medicine of my heart in my trials concerning this sacrament. Even if we had no other passage than this we could sufficiently strengthen all consciences and sufficiently overcome all adversaries. O, how Dr. Karlstadt feared this verse and set out to build a great

strong dome above himself against this thunderbolt. But when he sought for stone and lime, he found only cobweb and chaff, as we will see when we come to the fragile interpolation of his spiritual and scriptureless brain.

But observe first that Paul says nothing about *touto* or *tauta*, nor does he busy himself with small or capital letters. Clearly he declares, "The bread that we break." Especially, he notes, "that we break." Not only Christ broke it at the Supper. Thereby Dr. Karlstadt's lie is demolished, for he holds that even if Christ had given his body and blood in the Supper as a food it would not necessarily follow that Christians also or we should afterwards do so. Our answer is this, "The bread that we break," "we, we, we." Who is "we"? I hope that Dr. Karlstadt will find yet another *touto* in Greek, which will tell us that "we" means "Christ alone." His Peter Rültz will then boast that the Greek language does not permit otherwise.

Observe, secondly, that Paul is speaking of bread in the sacrament, which Christ broke, and afterwards also the apostles broke it. "Breaking" is nothing but breaking into pieces and distributing, in Hebrew fashion—Isa. 58[:7]: "Break your bread with the hungry"; Lam. 4[:4]: "The children beg for bread, but no one breaks it unto them." So the factious spirits have no reason to charge us again as betraying Christ, because we do not break the bread into crumbs with our fingers, but take the host in larger pieces. For they insist on such breaking and are not satisfied if it is otherwise broken into pieces, as by hand, knife, or other means as it was broken among the Jews. Remember also that Paul does not call it the form of bread as the papists do, but calls it frankly and simply bread. Thus we may know that we do not sin in this respect either when we call it bread and use it in St. Paul's fashion, though the papists call it heresy.

Observe, in the third place, that he clearly and distinctly asserts, "The bread which we break is a participation in the body of Christ." Do you hear, my dear brother? The bread which is broken or distributed piece by piece is the participation in the body of Christ. It is, it is, it is, he says, the participation in the body of Christ. Wherein does the participation in the body of Christ consist? It cannot be anything else than that as each takes a part of the broken bread he takes therewith the body of Christ. This fellowship is really a participation, so that in communion with each other they receive the common body of Christ, as he himself said, "We who are many are one body, for we all partake of the same loaf." On this account it has from ancient times been called *communio*, that is a fellowship [participation; *koinōnia*].

At this point Dr. Karlstadt distorts meaning in masterful fashion, and would gladly take the edge off this verse and make it dull in advance, so that no one would see how badly he was hit. Because of the perverted nature of his spirit, he makes everything spiritual and inward which God has determined should be outward and bodily; on the other hand he makes that outward and bodily which God wills should be inward and spiritual, as I have already said. So here he turns his attention to the word "participation" and wants to become spiritual and make of it a spiritual participation. He holds that they have participation in the body of Christ who with "desire" recall the suffering of Christ and suffer also with him, etc., which is a new terminology they have invented to describe their new understanding.

But if we ask for the reason and Scripture to prove this interpretation or where is the text that requires this meaning, he points us to the vent of a chimney, or to the man who came and told him this. How could he do otherwise? He could not tolerate the verse, yet could not defend himself. So, rather than thus read it, he thought, I will twist it to suit myself. If Scripture will not help, my big head will, for it is full of spirit. It is enough, it tells me even more about it,

namely that the participation in the suffering of Christ is identical with participation in the body and blood of Christ. Isn't that fine? Indeed, very fine. Only one letter is involved here so that we change the "d" to "b" and the "b" to "d." So we get the word for body [*Leib*] from the word for suffering [*Leid*], and vice versa. There you have it, as an eel by the taft. For this you need produce no Scripture.

Let the mad spirit go his way. We shall refute his interpretation in the following manner. First, participation in the suffering of Christ cannot be participation in the body and blood of Christ. For whoever suffers with Christ or partakes in his sufferings, must be devout, spiritual, and believing. A sinful, carnal person does not do thus. But even the unworthy partake of the body of Christ, according to Paul in 1 Cor. 11[:29]: "Whoever eats the bread in an unworthy manner eats judgment upon himself." This happened at the Supper to Judas the traitor who participated with the other disciples in the body and blood of Christ and partook with them. For he received it, ate, and drank just as the other disciples did.

Dr. Karlstadt makes a spiritual participation out of the partaking of the body and blood of Christ and does not want to accept the idea that it is a receiving of the body and blood in bread and cup. I shall let St. Paul take care of this view, when he says, "The bread that we break is the participation in the body of Christ" [1 Cor. 10:16]. Now no one can deny that the breaking of bread is a bodily, outward, act. They themselves say that an outward breaking or eating is nothing, but we must eat the body of Christ in a spiritual manner, etc. How then can the outward breaking of bread and eating be a spiritual participation, as Dr. Karlstadt claims? Moreover, the unworthy and godless also break bread and eat, as Judas Iscariot and certain Corinthians did (1 Cor. 11[:29]). They, thus, participate in the body of Christ and partake of it, as an interpretation of this verse requires, since the breaking of bread is a participation in the body of Christ. We must let this verse stand as it is, so that, when one breaks this bread, there is a participation in the body of Christ.

We are driven to the conclusion that Paul does not here speak of the spiritual participation, which only the saints have, of which Dr. Karlstadt dreams. But he speaks of a bodily participation, both by the holy and unholy, just as both break bread. So we see that the dream of Dr. Karlstadt is a lie. Probably he thought, "I will seize on the word 'participation' alone and torture it and will not notice the following words, 'the bread which we break,' etc. Otherwise they will not put up with my participation. But if I do not notice this, no one will observe it or have anything against the word 'participation,' and I will have won. I need do no more than I think: people are altogether blind."

Why then did St. Paul not simply say, "The bread, which we break, is the body of Christ," instead of adding, "The participation in the body of the Lord"? I reply, why did he not also simply say, "The bread is the body of the Lord," as the Evangelists did and he himself said in 1 Cor. 11[:24; 10:16], instead of adding, "which we break"? He added this phrase undoubtedly because he wanted to speak as clearly and distinctly as ever he could and that he might forcefully guard against the error of Dr. Karlstadt. He wanted to speak of the bread of the sacrament and this he could not do better than by speaking of the broken bread. Also he wanted to teach that each one in his piece received the body of Christ, Therefore he did not want to call only the whole loaf the body of Christ, but also that which was distributed in the congregation and through the breaking of bread given to all in common. Thus this breaking of bread was not the body of Christ alone but participation in the body of Christ, that is, a body

distributed to and received by all in the congregation. He could not have spoken more clearly and strongly. For with these words during the breaking, distributing, and receiving of the bread, he can see what happens when we break and offer and receive the bread. He says that such broken bread is participation in the body of Christ, so that they all in common and as one receive the one body of Christ and become partakers of it bodily.

So observe and mark well once again how this evasive devil has no other recourse than, as is his custom, to spiritualize that which God has made to be bodily, yet gives or cites no argument or reason for doing so. He does it rather as one who had power to establish articles of faith as he wishes. So here he says the bodily participation in the body of Christ must be spiritual, just as afterwards he does with the unworthy eating and drinking. As we shall see, he proceeds in a similar manner in regard to the discerning of the body of Christ [1 Cor. 11:29]. I will give you a good description of him only so that you may learn to know and recognize the devil.

It is a very fine little discovery that I too could well employ if a verse which spoke of a bodily act were too much for me and hit me on the head so that my brain was dazed. I would go to it and say, "I wasn't hit. The verse speaks of spiritual things," and so I would be free from providing any proof for such an interpretation. Under such circumstances it would be easy to be a heavenly prophet. If I were compelled to produce proof, I would withstand all argument as butter does the sun. I would need a towel for my sweat, and say, "My proof seemed to me to be so perfect and correct."

So this verse of Paul stands like a rock and forcefully requires the interpretation that all who break this bread, receive, and eat it, receive the body of Christ and partake of it. As we have said, it cannot be spiritual, so it must be a bodily participation. For one cannot partake of the body of Christ except in two ways, spiritually or bodily. Again, this bodily participation cannot be visible or perceived by the senses, else the bread would not remain. Nor can it be merely natural bread, otherwise it would be a bodily partaking not of the body of Christ, but of bread. Consequently, where the broken bread is present, there the body of Christ is truly and bodily present, though not of course visibly. Whoever boasts that he can dent this verse, will, I promise, find hard chewing.

In the third place we have the verse in 1 Cor. 11[:27], "Whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord." Here again the sectarian spirit goes off and makes into spiritual that which St. Paul affirms is body, and attributes unworthy eating to those who do not have a right understanding of Christ and remembrance of his body. If again you ask, where is this written? What is the basis for it? Where is the text? He will show his anger and give no other evidence than that he has been burned by such verses, and would rather forestall them as impertinent, just as if I would seek to persuade some one who waved a naked sword over me to believe that it was a straw, so that he would not strike me. But it doesn't help to tremble before death. O helpless spirit, how long do you think you can evade the producing of Scripture or text? Are you not ashamed to have been active so long in injecting your anger, your lies, your dreams into Scripture?

All right, when Paul here says, "Whoever eats and drinks unworthily," etc., he made a mistake. He should have said thus, "Whoever remembers the Lord unworthily or does not know him," etc. "The unworthy eating and drinking is the unworthy understanding and remembrance of the Lord,' unless perchance Dr. Karlstadt's spirit fails him here. But who would believe that?

You must imagine that St. Paul was drunk that evening, and when he spoke of unworthy eating and drinking, he forgot and talked too much, for he should have spoken about unworthy remembrance. But Dr. Karlstadt has caught the right meaning on a sober morning and has now put St. Paul's word straight in its right order. So he is thanked by Peter Rültz and the bride of Orlamünde.

Now let us have our say. St. Paul connects here the bread and the body of Christ with each other, even as he did above, when he said, "The bread that we break is the participation in the body of Christ." He does not say, "The bread that we break is the participation in the bread of the Lord," though this would have sounded fine to Dr. Karlstadt. So here he does not say, "Whoever is unworthy of this bread, he sins or is guilty of profaning the bread of the Lord," as again Dr. Karlstadt would like to have it, but, "is guilty of profaning the body of the Lord," so that in both places he maintains that the bread of the Lord is the body of the Lord. For if this is not what he meant, he would have had to say, as above, "Whoever is unworthy of this bread, he is guilty of profaning the bread of the Lord." How can you sin in eating the body of the Lord, if he is not present in the eating or the bread? Or you would have to say thus, "Whoever is unworthy of this bread, he is guilty of profaning the Lord's Supper, or God, or the commandment, or the ordinance of the Lord."

Now the nature and character of the sentence requires us to interpret it to mean that whoever eats unworthily is guilty in regard to what he eats. Therefore, it is not enough for Dr. Karlstadt to say "no" and insert an interpolation. Since the text here is clear, and the nature and meaning of the language used affirm that whoever eats this bread unworthily is guilty of profaning the body of the Lord because the body of the Lord is eaten in the bread, and sin is committed in the eating and drinking, therefore he would have to bring forward convincing verses and text, if we were to believe him. For the text forcefully compels the interpretation that sin is committed in the eating and drinking, as it says, "Whoever eats and drinks unworthily," and yet claims that the same sin has to do with the body and blood of the Lord. This strongly indicates that it is in the eating of the body and drinking of the blood of Christ that the unworthy one has offended and therein committed evil.

For the unworthy remembrance of the Lord is a separate sin other than the unworthy eating, and St. Paul says nothing of it in this place. All the words in the entire chapter where he condemns the unworthy eating indicate that the sin consists wholly in eating and drinking. St. Paul terrifies them lest they think it is merely bread or wine which they eat and drink, thereby becoming unworthy, when it is the body and blood of Christ, which makes them guilty of such unworthy eating. Such, I said, is the natural meaning, and one can see that Dr. Karlstadt's mocking objections are altogether artificial, forced and obstinate, on which no conscience or faith can rely.

It is not sound reasoning arbitrarily to associate the sin which St. Paul attributes to eating with remembrance of Christ, of which Paul does not speak. For he does not say, "Who unworthily holds the Lord in remembrance," but, "Who unworthily eats and drinks." Now there would be no rhyme or reason in saying one becomes guilty of profaning the body of Christ through unworthy eating or the blood of Christ by unworthy drinking, if the body was not in that which was eaten and the blood in that which was drunk. Why too should it be necessary for him even to distinguish between the two offenses, unworthy eating in regard to the body of the Lord and unworthy drinking in regard to the blood of the Lord?

Why does he not put it thus: Whoever unworthily eats this bread is guilty of profaning the blood of the Lord. Who unworthily drinks of this cup is guilty of profaning the body of the Lord? If Dr. Karlstadt's meaning were correct, one of the two would be enough. Indeed it would be sufficient if he had said, "Who eats and drinks unworthily is guilty of profaning Christ or the death of Christ," since Dr. Karlstadt interprets the sin of unworthy eating to be that one does not rightly honor and observe the suffering and death of Christ. But inasmuch as Paul makes the unworthy drinking of the cup to mean the same as profaning the blood, and the unworthy eating of the bread to mean the same as profaning the body, the clear, natural sense of the words is that the body is in the eating, and the blood is in the drinking. And no one can produce an argument to the contrary which has any show of validity.

In brief, this is the spirit of whom I have already said that he makes inward whatever God makes outward. So he has to do here. The guilt which Paul places in the bodily eating and drinking he makes an inner one, in a spiritual eating and drinking. From the fact that he fumes that those unworthily eat and drink who do not inwardly acknowledge the body of Christ nor rightly hold him in remembrance, we can understand that he transfers the eating and drinking into the spirit, though Paul considers it an outward act. For spiritual eating is the right recognition and remembrance of the body of Christ. Do you not again become aware of this devil with all his spirituality, though he has no basis, Scripture, argument, or other evidence than what he spins from his own brain?

Fourthly, St. Paul writes in the same chapter, "Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment upon himself" [1 Cor. 11:28–29]. But here comes Peter Rültz again, blowing his own horn, posing as a Greek, and says that the word *diakrinōn* means "discerning." It also refers to remembrance, meaning that we must in spirit sharply discern the body of Christ and imitate the suffering of Christ with "calm desire" and fervor, etc. Everything that this spirit teaches must be related to the spiritual remembrance of Christ. Rültz knows no other tune. Would that he knew it well and were not using it as a cloak to spread his poison.

Dear Peter, I beg you put your glasses on your nose, or blow your nose a bit, to make your head lighter and the brain clearer. Look a little closer with us on the text. You say that the discerning belongs to the remembrance. But Paul says it applies to the eating and drinking. For he does not say, "Who unworthily holds the Lord in remembrance merits judgment, since he does not discern the body of the Lord." But he speaks thus, "Who eats and drinks unworthily, he eats and drinks judgment to himself, for he does not discern the body of the Lord." Do you hear that, Peter? In an unworthy eating and drinking this discerning is lacking, therefore judgment is the penalty. Is that not clear enough? Does not the text demand this?

I should like to give Dr. Karlstadt two gulden again if only once in all this discussion he would help, not me, but his own cause by doing one of two things: either by producing passages from Scripture, or by showing that a selected text demands an interpretation proving his cause to be right. Now, however, he does nothing more than latch on to a small word and smears over with his spittle as he pleases, but meanwhile he does not take into account other texts which overthrow him who smears and spits, so that he is up-ended with all four limbs in the air. So here, after he has raved and smeared for a long time that the discerning belongs to the remembrance of the Lord, he does not see that the text clearly states that it belongs to the

unworthy eating and drinking. So also, as above, when he wanted to make the participation of the body of Christ spiritual, he did not notice that the bodily breaking of bread broke his neck.

He is like the ostrich, the foolish bird which thinks it is wholly concealed when it gets its neck under a branch. Or like small children, who hold their hands in front of their eyes and seeing nobody imagine that no one sees them either. This spirit acts in the same way. He grabs at a small word, with which he covers himself, but lets the whole text be, which leaves him uncovered and shames him. I don't know if he imagines that there are no Bibles or people left in the world. Against me he will accomplish nothing, though I verily warned him at Jena he had better make sure of hitting his mark, for I would not miss mine. But he interpreted my words as he interprets the Bible, and calls it a hit when he calls me "mad sophist," "bloody sow," "papist twice over," and epithets of similar nature. But I want him to take the matter seriously and hit the mark. I was about to say, the mass for the soul is invalid, for the coin is a "copper" [instead of silver]. But it was the work of God which hardened and blinded the heart of Pharaoh [Exod. 4:21ff.] to the honor of his truth and word, bringing comfort to all believers and terror to the arrogant.

So we conclude that this discerning is to take place in the eating and drinking, as above; guilt and sin occurs in relation to the body of the Lord. Who, thus, eats and drinks unworthily eats unto his judgment. Why? Because, Paul says, he does not discern the body of Christ. Now tell me, how does one discern the body of the Lord in eating and drinking? The Greek word, *diakrinein*, in Latin, *discernere*, means to make a distinction, and not to think of one thing like the other, but to consider the one thing nobler, better, more precious than the other. St. Paul means that whoever eats and drinks unworthily, fittingly deserves judgment or severe punishment, because with his unworthy eating and drinking he does not distinguish, does not discern, the body of Christ, but thinks of and treats the bread and wine of the Lord as if it were merely bread and wine, though it is the body and blood of the Lord. For if he seriously thought of it as the body of the Lord, he would not act so carelessly, as if it were ordinary bread, but would eat with fear, humility, and reverence. He ought of course have a sense of awe before the body of the Lord.

If this is not the correct view, you give another and tell what it means to discern the body of Christ. For the word has only this meaning, that we should look on the body of Christ as something better and more precious than any thing else having a significance all its own. This is sufficiently required by these words. Since St. Paul bears witness to and wants such discerning in the eating and drinking of the Lord's bread and cup, it is sufficiently borne out by the text that we should consider the body of Christ as better and more important than the bread and the cup. So it must follow that the body and blood of Christ are there in the bread and cup. They eat to judgment who eat unworthily by not discerning the body of Christ, and those who eat worthily do rightly discern it.

But one ought not blame Dr. Karlstadt. As I have said, since his spirit is bent on making spiritual what God wants to be bodily, he has to treat the discernment in this way, making recognition and remembrance a spiritual discernment, inward in the spirit, when God intends a bodily discernment, between bread and the body of Christ. Should one require him to show the basis and reason for his position, or to present a compelling argument on the basis of the text? Brother, do not bewilder him with such a request. Don't you see that he has other things to do?

It is enough that such a man says it. If you don't believe him, believe his gray peasant coat and felt hat, in which, as you ought to know, the Holy Spirit must be.

This high art of Dr, Karlstadt reminds me of that practiced by those who are fond of allegories, whom St. Jerome in his *Prologue* compares to jugglers. I might make out of Dietrich of Bern, Christ; out of the giant with whom he fought, the devil; out of the dwarf, humility; out of his prison, the death of Christ. Or I might take any other tale or legend of knights to exercise my imagination or toy with, as he did who applied Ovid's *Metamorphoses* entirely to Christ.

Or to anticipate the objection of my spirits that I compare their ways to secular fables, let me take the legend of St. George and say that St. George was Christ, the maiden he saved was Christendom, the dragon of the sea was the devil, the horse was the human nature of Christ, the spear was the gospel, etc. Likewise, when St. Peter sank in the sea [Matt. 14:27ff.] and Christ helped him, I might say that the sea is the persecution and tribulation in the world, Peter any Christian in doubt, and Christ the grace of God, etc.

Such is the trifling art with which these prophets busy themselves. They have discovered many similar interpretations in the Old Testament and daily find more. They teach much about the sevenfold sprinkling, and fill their books with this kind of skill, as if it were such a priceless thing which nobody but themselves knew about. In general, their interpretation is so stupid that it makes one feel like vomiting, especially their sevenfold sprinkling. They do not consider that such has to be proved from Scripture and that it means nothing unless it is clearly expressed elsewhere, as I have explained in the sermon on the ten lepers.[148] For them, however, it is enough just to have contrived it, thereby it is proved.

So Dr. Karlstadt does here. Since he had learned these things from his prophets, and by nature has a strange head which always looks for that which is unusual and no one hitherto has known, he launches out and tries to play dice with the words of St. Paul, as was his custom in treating the Old Testament, interpreting them allegorically. Consequently he must make St. Paul speak of spiritual, not bodily participation, of spiritual, not bodily discerning, of spiritual, not bodily unworthiness in eating, of spiritual, not bodily guilt in regard to the body of the Lord. And the silly, feeble devil thinks no one sees him. No, my fellow, we see you well enough. You haven't used enough make-up; you need more and other colors.

You may say that it is nonetheless true that the sea signifies persecution, and Christ, the grace of God, and sinking, weakness or despair. And it is true, that the grace of God helps in despair. And it is not wrong or false that there is a spiritual participation, a spiritual discerning of the body of Christ, a spiritual unworthy eating, a spiritual guilt of the body of Christ. Generally, all such allegories or interpretations are in fact true and very attractive and fine. My answer to this is that I am not contending as to their falsehood or truth. But I know well, that they often are amiss and pure fancy, because they are brought forward without any scriptural foundation, just as these prophetical sprinklings, with which they toy, are pure nonsense.

What I do contend against is not only Dr. Karlstadt's attempt to establish his views without basis in Scripture, but also his attempt through such lofty spiritual semblance forcefully to suppress, deny, and falsify the true, scriptural meaning, which naturally derives from the text but which his mockery will not endure. If he lets the natural meaning remain inviolate, I will let him interpret allegorically and spiritually, juggle and play, until he tires. If someone will permit me to retain the meaning that Peter, according to the scriptural sense, did walk on the sea and

sank, etc., it is no longer my concern how he interprets it afterwards, provided no harm is done to faith.

So if Dr. Karlstadt leaves untouched the bodily participation of the body of Christ, the bodily discerning, the bodily unworthiness in eating, the bodily guilt in unworthy eating, etc., I for my part will let him do what he wants. For St. Paul also in Rom. 12[:6] says, "Let prophecy be in proportion to our faith," so that each one does not interpret what and how he pleases and thereby lead the conscience astray. For it is real jugglery to make a thing seem to have happened and to exist, when there is nothing to it. Just as Dr. Karlstadt's spiritual interpretation seems to him and his followers to be a remarkably precious one. But when one examines it under the light and according to the text, it is revealed as pure jugglery. Devoid of foundation or truth, it is the product of his own fancy, and forced upon the text.

If such spiritual juggling were to prevail, I would like to put Dr. Karlstadt and all his prophets to school for another three years. I was thoroughly drilled in this method when I first began to study the Bible ten years ago, before I discovered the true method. I too would carelessly say: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," Gen. 1[:1]: Heaven refers to the angels and the spiritual creatures; earth refers to the bodily creatures. Don't you think this was splendidly and truly said? Yes, but meanwhile what happened to the text? How could I prove, that in this verse heaven and earth are not the natural heaven and earth, as the words say? Brother, the natural meaning of the words is queen, transcending all subtle, acute sophistical fancy. From it we may not deviate, unless we are compelled by a clear article of the faith. Otherwise the spiritual jugglers would not leave a single letter in Scripture.

In this manner even the great teacher Origen played the fool, and led St. Jerome and many others astray with him. In former times his books were justly forbidden and condemned on account of such spiritual tomfoolery. For it is dangerous so to play with the Word of God by which conscience and faith are to be guided. Therefore, interpretations of God's Word must be lucid and definite having a firm, sure, and true foundation on which one may confidently rely.

These are the main points in this matter, by which, through the grace of God, we satisfy every good conscience in order to confirm their faith. If we do not thereby convert the hardened Karlstadtians, we have nonetheless successfully contended against them in these two matters. First, that they can neither prove their assertions with Scripture nor wrest them from the text, but produce only their own notions and ideas, presuming thereby to obscure clear passages but in vain. To our interpretation he said, "No," for which we demanded no proof without giving our own, which we then did. But he proposed another interpretation without offering any foundation—a scandalous thing of so lofty a spirit! Secondly, everything they brought against us was unconvincing and did not stand the test. Finally, we defied them to do their best. We are determined to stand up to them and their cleverness, whether past, present, or future, with no other passages from Scripture [than those adduced by us]. They shall not thus deprive us of them. For the only source of Dr. Karlstadt's strength lies in applying arbitrarily and without proof everything attributed by the evangelists and apostles in clear words to the eating and drinking [in the sacrament] to the remembrance of the Lord. Let another come, who can do better.

Suppose now, despite all, Dr. Karlstadt's bluster prevailed and overcame our faith (though this is impossible). What would he then have accomplished? Not on that account would his faith thereby be right or certain. For he proves nothing, but only recites his claims, as one might

recite a fairy tale, giving no basis, or Scripture, or reason. No conscience can rest or depend on such a foundation, which would be nothing more than the word of Dr. Karlstadt. Thus, whoever follows Dr. Karlstadt's opinion must fall between two chairs and be suspended between heaven and earth. Of the sacrament he would retain nothing at all. For he who has neither a basis nor a single passage of Scripture on his side, forsakes our faith, and cannot comprehend it. I have often asserted that the ultimate goal of the devil is to do away with the entire sacrament and all outward ordinances of God. Then as these prophets teach, all that would count would be for the heart to stare inwardly at the spirit.

Everyone now clearly sees, I think, that Dr. Karlstadt's spirit is one that seeks to fool the people with the word "spiritual," and undertakes to make everything spiritual which God has made bodily. With this talent he manages to put on a good show and attract attention. If only he would establish a basis for his view, not only claiming, thus, thus it is, but prove that it is and must be so because of what is in the text, then he would be a fine spirit. But since he speaks only on his own, we can say: You lie, dear spirit. All men are liars [Ps. 116:11]. The pope has lied in the same manner. But his spirit has rather busied itself in making spiritual things bodily, as he transforms a spiritual Christendom into an outward, bodily community. This sectarian spirit, on the other hand, is mostly concerned about making spiritual what God makes bodily and outward. We therefore proceed between the two, making nothing spiritual or bodily, but keeping spiritual what God makes spiritual, and bodily what he makes bodily.

If now some still persist and remain in this error and view of the Karlstadtian sacrament, or later fall into it, what would be their lot? What indeed would be our attitude even if the whole world rejected our interpretation? How are we to consider the gospel, on which certainly more depends? Does not the whole world reject and resist it? How few are they who rightly hold to it? Don't let yourself be misled if only a few rightly treat and believe the sacrament. Let him who will be gone, but make sure where you stand. It is not surprising that many go astray. The wonder is that there are some who do not go astray, few though they are. Christ himself said, "Do you think when the Son of man comes, he will find faith on earth?" [Luke 18:8]. I am not to blame for any one who now errs. I have surely warned and taught faithfully.

Concerning Frau Hulda, Dr. Karlstadt's Shrewd Reason, in this Sacrament

Now that we have shown our scriptural foundation and proven our faith, while refuting Dr. Karlstadt's argument, let us see how splendidly he speaks in this matter when he seeks counsel of his reason, which first of all gives him his proper foundation. For Dr. Karlstadt is now much madder than ever the papists were. The papists at least have always been anxious to adduce evidence from Scripture, though they have used it falsely. But Dr. Karlstadt has only *touto* and *tauta*, periods and capitals, and interpolations out of his own head, with never a verse from Scripture. Thus, the papists confess that in the matter of the sacrament we are to follow Scripture, not reason. But Dr. Karlstadt scrapes and collects whatever reason can show, teach, or judge. Are they not merry prophets and heavenly spirits?

The first sample of this highly praised reason is its conclusion that if the body and blood of Christ were in the sacrament, it would have to follow that the bread was crucified and given for us and not Christ himself, since the text reads, "This is my body given for you." This Frau Hulda interprets to mean the same as saying, "The bread is given for you." This again means, "My

body is not given for you before it has become bread," etc. How does this cleverness appeal to you? Defy them and say that they are no heavenly prophets. If you ask where they learned such grammar, or by what reasoning they thus interpret the word of Christ, you may probably hear the heavenly voice.

Let us proceed. This is pure knavery with which the devil here deals. Tell me, Frau Hulda, you who are so pure and will not tolerate our adding or taking away a syllable from the word of God, why are you here so filthy? You add so many words and say, "My body is not given for you before it has become bread"? Also, why do you break up the sentence and say, "The bread which is given for you"? Show me where it is written that we should understand or explain the words, "This is my body, which is given for you," to mean, "This bread is given for you," or "My body is not given for you before it becomes bread." In any language this sentence cannot be understood except in this sense, "This is my body, given for you," etc. There is no other body, given for you, than the one which in death I give you to eat. From this it does not follow that it would at the same moment be eaten and crucified, but that which was eaten in this moment, the same would afterwards, when it is not eaten, be given for you.

Let me take John the Baptist as an example, when he pointed to Christ and said, "Behold, the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" [John 1:29]. Listen to this, sectarian spirit: John said there that Christ bears or takes away the sin of the world, yet he is not on the cross. My dear friend, continue and say from this it follows that Christ is not crucified for us. For the words read that Christ did not bear the sins of the world before John pointed him out and called him the Lamb of God. For there is no other Christ crucified for us, and he is not crucified at any other time or place than when John pointed him out by the Jordan river. There he bore our sins, before he was crucified, just as here he is given for us in the bread.

In John 10[:11] Christ says, "I am the good shepherd and lay down my life for my sheep." Ha, dear sectarian spirit, let us learn from you that since Christ says of himself that he gives his life for us, it must follow that this happens in the moment when in the synagogue of the Jews he says this of and about himself, and not on the cross, so that he is not afterwards crucified for us. For the words say nothing else than, "I give my life" [John 10:15]. They do not say, "I will give my life," just as here he says, "which is given for you," and not, "which shall be given for you." So also one has to understand him when he says, "I give them eternal life" [John 10:28], and not, "I will give them." So also in John 19 [17:19], he says, "And for their sake I consecrate myself"; he does not say, "I will consecrate myself." You ought to feel shame in your hearts, you great gruff asses' heads, who pretend to such great skill in interpreting the Scriptures that you let such stuff go out into the world, from which it is clear that either on account of your great wickedness you do not want to, or on account of your great ignorance you cannot, either rightly speak or understand what is spoken.

If this devil insists so strongly on the words, "Which is given for you," as present in tense, and not to be understood as "Which in the future shall be given for you," we throw his word back at him and say that if the words, "This is my body," refers to the body of the seated Christ, then it must follow that Christ is not crucified for us. For the word is attributed to Christ as he sits there, and not to him on the cross. For he could not hang on the cross and at the same time be at the supper table. So he could not be given for us at any other time than when he sat there and said this of himself. Is not this a case where cleverness becomes ridiculous?

If now you heavenly prophets can allow that Christ sits at the table and his word, “Which is given for you,” is to be so interpreted that the “is given” means “Shall be given,” or “It is so determined and ordained that he shall be given,” thus agreeing that his sitting at the table and referring to his body takes place at one time and his being crucified and giving himself at another, then we ask that you do not object to the statement that his body is in the bread and afterwards on the cross when it is not in the bread. Then we may say concerning the bread, “This is my body given for you,” in the sense that it shall be given for us, or it is already determined and ordained to be given, as if it were already given.

Where are you now, Frau Hulda, with your cleverness? Indeed, where is your inner witness, since you do not need the outer witness? This I tell you, my dear reader, so that you may get to know the annoying devil who takes advantage of Dr. Karlstadt. For in this matter of reason Peter Rültz boasts very loftily, and here speaks aptly in the manner of the heavenly prophets, namely, as we said, they do not come through the external Word to the spirit but from the spirit they come to the external Word. They hold to the word of Christ in John 12 [John 15:26–27]: “The Spirit of truth will bear witness and you also will be witnesses,” just as if the apostles had received the Spirit without the external Word of Christ. Satiated with the inner witness, Peter Rültz boasts that he receives the external in order to teach and correct others.

There you have their theology: Others are to learn outwardly by their word, which they call an external witness. But they themselves are better and superior to the apostles, and pretend to learn inwardly in their spirit without an external Word and without means, though this possibility was not given to the apostles, but alone to the only Son, Jesus Christ. Thus you see how this devil, as I said already, disregards the external Word and does not wish to have it as a forerunner to the Spirit. Learn to shy away from such and be assured that these prophets are full of the devil. This is clear from this first aspect of the way they employ reason, and will become clearer. Such an exalted spirit which is above the apostles ought also forsooth demonstrate his superiority by great signs. But in the same manner as they prove their doctrine and external witness with Scripture, so they prove their spirit and inward witness with signs. The one devil is like the other.

If only Dr. Karlstadt and his gang could forego their sophistry and rationalism, since the word of Christ spoken over the bread, “This is my body,” is a source of difficulty and anxiety for them. They neither can nor want to understand how bread might still be the body, and ought to do one of two things: Either give God honor and let his Word remain right and true, even though they don’t understand how it can be that it is right and true, and be satisfied with it and believe it when they hear that God so speaks and wants it this way. Or, if they want to be really clever, let them follow the customary meaning of Scripture and simple sense of its language, setting aside their subtleties and craftiness.

For if we heed the simple sense of the language we can say of a glowing piece of iron, “It is fire,” or, “The iron lying there is pure fire.” If now a contentious sophist wanted to show off his smartness and set himself up against the whole world, declaring iron and fire were two different things and it could never be that iron was fire, tell me, would he not be a senseless fool? He would be trying to teach the people to exchange their simple way of speaking for his keen and sharp sophistry, though the simple sense of the words, “The iron is pure fire,” is nothing more than saying that the iron and fire are in each other, so that where the iron is

there the fire is also. And no one is so stupid that he here needs some great and clever sophistry to tell him that wood is not stone, fire is not iron, water is not earth.

Since now iron is fire and fire is iron, according to the simple sense of language, and the two are in each other and as one, though each retains its own nature, they might well have exercised humility, foregoing their cleverness and smartness, and following Christ and all the world in the simple meaning of the word and say of the bread, "This is my body." This would mean the same as saying, bread and body are as one or in each other, as fire and iron. No one is so stupid as to deny that body and bread are two different things. We use similar expressions about the human nature of Christ, when we say, "He is God," and, "God is man." Yet no one stupidly avers that the divine and the human are not two different natures, or that one can be transformed into the other. The simple statement means that in Christ divinity and humanity are as one so that God is bodily present [Col. 2:9] where the human person is, as Paul asserts.

So the simple meaning of the words could easily have given them what they sought for in their cleverness and contrived sharpness of reason at the expense of so much unnecessary toil and work for themselves and others. And you will see, as they progress, that they do not want to honor the Word of God in faith nor receive it according to the simple use of language. Instead, with their sophisticated reason and refined subtlety they want to measure and master it until they finally come to the point where they will deny that Christ is God. For to reason it sounds just as foolish to say, "Man is God," as, "The bread is the body." And as they deny the one they will soon also boldly deny the other. Such is also the aim of the devil, who has led them away from Scripture into their own reason, thereby bringing back again all the ancient heresies. You will be surprised how clever reason can be, especially in the mad mob, when it shakes its head and says, yes, godhead and humanity are two different things, separated infinitely from each other as the eternal from the temporal. How then can the one be the other, or any one say, "Man is God"? You must therefore reply: the temporal is eternal, mortal is immortal and the like, as reason foolishly imagines in Dr. Karlstadt's head against the sacrament, and it will thus have come upon the truth in splendid fashion!

Or if this sort of speaking does not please them, they form their judgment in accordance with the manner of speech employed in Scripture which contains a common figure of speech called synecdoche. This occurs when the name of a whole is given to a part, as Scripture does when it calls the people of Israel a "possession" and a peculiar people of God [Exod. 19:5], though a majority always belonged to the devil and only a minority was God's people. So also Paul, in his letters to the Galatians [Gal. 1:2] and Corinthians [1 Cor. 1:21] and elsewhere, called the congregation God's though only the smaller part consisted of true children of God. Indeed in 1 Cor. 10[:1] he calls them all one bread and one body who drink of the one cup, though many of them drink unworthily of the cup, as he himself says.

These sophists and keen smart alecks in this place could have applied the whole passage about bread and body, of which Jesus spoke when he said, "This is my body," solely to the body, regardless of the bread. Not that the bread did not belong here, but in his words he placed as much importance on the body as if only the body were present and everything else, be it bread or color, was nothing more than the body. Just as if a mother should point to a cradle in which her child lay and should say, "That is my child," and a sophist should ridicule her, saying, "What? Is the cradle your child?" Don't you think she would think him a fool or a

crank? In his obstinacy he did not want to understand her words, as she pointed to both the cradle and the child, and yet meant especially the child, as if the cradle were not there.

Thus St. Paul, in Rom. 1[:16] calls the preached gospel a power of God. Now let a clever sophist interrupt who knows that the power of God (which is eternal) is to be distinguished from utterance by word of mouth which immediately dies away. He wants to prove his skill and bring forward a *touto* or *tauta* and concludes, the bodily voice cannot be the power of God. So St. Paul is lying when he speaks of a bodily vocal sound as the power of God. St. Peter, too, is subject to the same criticism, as he says (1 Pet. 1[:25], "The Word of God remains forever." Isaiah [40:8] also speaks thus meaning the Word that is preached among us. How can this be true, that an eternal thing can be transient?

A sophist cannot believe this, but whoever knows the common use of Scripture is not misled by it, but rather easily understands. It is well explained by the use of synecdoche which is much employed not only in Scripture, but in all languages. So here you see that this evil spirit cannot speak or understand even his mother tongue. Dr. Karlstadt, who pretends to a great knowledge in Greek and Hebrew would benefit if he and his prophets were led back to their mothers or to a German school, so that they might first learn how to speak and understand German.

A second aspect of such high-sounding reason is Dr. Karlstadt's claim to have proved that nothing other than bread and wine are in the sacrament, and that when Christ commanded us to receive his body, he meant, take the bread and eat. Therefore the decrepit preachers (*Hutzelprediger*, what beautiful German) should have proclaimed how one eats worthily of the Lord's bread, as Paul said. If now again I ask these lofty spirits, where is it written that Christ said, "Take the bread and eat," they most likely will point to the inward witness; let the Wizard of Oz believe that, not I. I know of no place where Christ told us to take the bread and eat. He did say, "Take, eat, this is my body." Here he tells me to take his body and eat, not bread. But this spirit has supreme power to fix and to change, to add and to take away, as he pleases. How can he err?

To confirm this kind of reason he blames the pope for many more grievous errors. First, the pope steals the honor due God, in that he tells us to respond to the form of the bread, My God, be merciful to me. Second, he contradicts the truth by teaching us to honor the bread and letting us forget the body of Christ. Third, he destroys the teachings of Paul, exalting the form of the bread to the point that we forget the remembrance of the Lord. Fourth, that he makes us foolish by teaching us to eat the bread with solemnity though we may never give a thought to Christ. Fifth, that he renders the suffering of Christ unnecessary in his teaching that Christ in the form of the bread forgives our sins and has redeemed us, and thus his death on the cross was in vain. There you have it, pope, you are done for. I hold that you have been vanquished. These five points he has spewed out in such disorder that I find it painful to bring any order into them.

What shall I do? If I answer him, then I am a priest. But Dr. Karlstadt has reasoned with himself. "The pope's errors have been brought to light by others before me. Now I, too, would be glad to win a medal of honor in combat with the dead body of Hector. But if I write what others have written and adduce nothing new, it would bring disgrace on me as a great heavenly prophet. All right, I will attack him and write pure lies about him." Now the pope and his followers have done me much more injury than Dr. Karlstadt, and still do so daily. In fact they have hitherto greatly despised Dr. Karlstadt. Yet I would not be so mad as to attack the pope

with what is generally known as a stinking lie. The pope and his crowd do not care when I hit the mark with obvious truth and clear Scripture. Why then should they pay any attention when Dr. Karlstadt strikes at them with what he knows are palpable falsehoods?

I am not concerned with the life of the pope and his people. We speak now of his teaching—not of his morals, but of his dogmas. Here I do not say that Dr. Karlstadt errs, but his conscience tells him that he obviously lies in what he says of the pope. For he too has been a sophist who has studied and taught the theology of the universities and of the pope. The pope nowhere teaches that one shall say to the sacramental bread, "My, God, be merciful to me," as all the world knows. Nor does he teach that we should hold in remembrance the bread but forget the body of Christ. Nor does he ever teach so high a regard for the bread that we forget remembrance of the Lord. He does not teach that we can eat the bread worthily even if in so doing we never give a thought to Christ. And he does not render unnecessary the suffering of Christ when he teaches that Christ in the form of the bread forgives our sins and redeems us, which in fact he does not teach. In these five points Dr. Karlstadt himself, as well as all the world, knows that he lies in his own conscience against the pope.

He should use other examples and reasons if he wants to show that the pope is guilty of stealing the honor due God, contradicting the truth, destroying the teaching of St. Paul, making people foolish, and the suffering of Christ unnecessary. For these examples rather prove that Dr. Karlstadt has a deceitful and evil spirit, who openly robs the people of their honor, contradicts his own conscience, and as a foolish rascal reveals his sin and shame before all the world. What a fine spirit we have here, who would drive out the devil by a devil. Indeed he would disgrace public truth with public lies.

What could be the purpose of Dr. Karlstadt in this shameless lying? I can imagine two reasons. First, that he might get the mob to think that what Luther and the others have done to the pope amounts to nothing. They all play the hypocrite with him. Here is our man. Dr. Karlstadt knows how to do it. He knows how to show up the pope. How about it, neighbor Andreas [Karlstadt] and dear cousin Peter? Second, in lumping Luther and the pope together, he might impress upon his bungling associate, Rültz, that Luther's teaching is identical with that of the pope—indeed that Luther is a papist twice over, for that is what he calls me, too. This Dr. Karlstadt's devil does, not because he is hostile to the pope's devil, who sent him to Dr. Karlstadt so as craftily to help the pope up again, but in order that he might destroy everything that God had accomplished hitherto by the gospel through us and the many souls who had been saved, which was bitter medicine to the devil.

So my readers now understand how bold and wicked this spirit of Dr. Karlstadt is, as he shamelessly and openly lies before the people against his own conscience in such great and important matters, where we should avoid as poison all error and doubt (to say nothing about obvious lies). They know that such a spirit cannot be anything else than an evil, wrathful devil. For it is not necessary to treat these questions, but through Dr. Karlstadt's envious hatred this spirit would take revenge on us and destroy our gospel. For we do not teach that the form of the bread should be adored, feared, or honored to the disregard of the Lord's death. Rather we do honor the body and blood of Christ in the bread, as he himself well knows, and he has furthermore attacked us throughout his book because we do not regard it as only bread or the form of bread. Yet he charges that we honor only bread, and in his folly contradicts himself.

So with more fairness on our side we could say that Dr. Karlstadt robs God of his honor, contradicts the truth, destroys the teaching of St. Paul, and makes the passion of Christ unnecessary, since he denies, in the face of clear and strong texts, that the body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament. He devises interpolations out of his head, which are supported neither by a semblance of truth nor by argument, Scripture and context. Finally he cannot help himself but spews out good, fat, strong lies, and like a mad person speaks against himself. And thus you have a second good example of the manner in which dear Reason pretends to authority in divine things. We had better wait until later to consider how it can be true that Christ forgives sin in the sacrament since he makes himself quite useless in this regard.

Frau Hulda's third example is her proof that the body of Christ is not in the sacrament because of the words of Christ, "The flesh is of no avail" (John 6[:63]) and, "It is to your advantage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the Counsellor will not come to you" [John 16:7]. Where, he says, has Christ commanded us to receive his body? This is a question he keeps bringing up in connection with his *touto* as though it were certain that he has won. We again reply as to one who has gone down to defeat in disgrace. Christ commands us to receive his body when he says, "Take, eat, this is my body." Let this be said once and for all as though it were said a thousand times in reply to this question. For the *touto* and capital letter and period have lost the day, as we have already proved.

Is this not a demonstration of consummate skill and a forceful conclusion: The flesh is of no avail, therefore one does not receive the body of Christ in the sacrament? What a perfect fit! Why not try this? Dr. Karlstadt is no longer at Orlamünde, therefore the body of Christ is not in the sacrament. It follows as well in one case as in the other. What difference does it make to the sacrament, either for or against, that the flesh of Christ is of no avail? Of what avail is it, when he sits at the supper table and, according to their dream, refers to himself in *touto*? You spirits, rather let me use your skill! The flesh of Christ is of no avail, therefore he does not sit at the table, and the *touto* cannot refer to him. Is this not as valid a conclusion as yours? Tell me, where is the flesh of Christ of avail? On the cross? In heaven? In the mother's womb? Where then? I suppose I'll soon hear that he cannot be anywhere, since his flesh is of no avail. For if it follows that Christ is not in the sacrament since the flesh of Christ is of no avail, it follows equally well that he is nowhere. For that the spirit must be present if the flesh is to be of avail is as true on the cross or in heaven as in the sacrament. What do you think? These are indeed heavenly prophets, and thus you should attack the sacrament if you wish to overthrow it!

Further, tell me, what is the benefit of your sacrament, your bread and wine? If it is not of any benefit, then there is no sacrament in the Supper and no one receives anything. For where that is which does not avail, there is nothing, as you yourselves say that the body of Christ cannot be there since his flesh is of no avail. What then of the Supper? For surely none will be or become as holy which will be of avail, since the flesh of Christ is of no avail, though it is the most holy of all. If that is not fanaticism and frenzy, brother, what is fanaticism and frenzy? I will not here show how the blind and bold spirit employs and perverts the word of Christ. For Christ does not say, "My flesh is of no avail," but thus, "Flesh is of no avail" [John 6:63]. But of his own flesh he says, "My flesh is food indeed" [John 6:55].

"Flesh" and "the flesh of Christ" are two very different things. So also, "The flesh of Christ is of no avail," is quite different from, "The flesh of Christ is of no avail to you or me." This I must further expound to prove that these spirits, who so despise the outward Word, do not have a

right understanding of Scripture. God is good [Luke 18:19], and all that he has created is good also (Gen. 1[:3]). What is good, is also "of avail." To the godless, however, nothing is good or "of avail," nothing pure and salutary, but everything is harmful, evil, unclean, and damnable, even God himself, not because of God or of what he has created but because of the lack of faith of those who misuse everything. So we should not say that the flesh of Christ is of no avail, but flesh is of no avail, as Paul says, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom" [1 Cor. 15:50]. Here "flesh" means a carnal mind, will, understanding or self-contrived opinion, as Paul in Rom. 8[:6] says, "To set the mind on the flesh is death." When Christ (John 6[:55]) speaks of his flesh and says it is "food indeed," he corrects the Jews who understand him in a carnal manner, by adding that his words are "spirit and life" [John 6:63]. Flesh is of no avail, that is, to understand his spiritual words in a carnal manner brings only death.

Yes, you say, the bread of the Lord and the cup are of benefit, if we worthily eat and drink, which means that we acknowledge and taste Christ, heartily and ardently. Brother, what can we say? Your bread and wine are of avail, if one eats and tastes with ardent knowledge. Why is not our sacrament also of avail when we eat and receive it in true faith? Or is the body and blood of Christ, when it is received with true faith in the sacrament, not as powerful as your frail bread and wine? Or is a true faith inferior to an ardent acknowledgment of Christ? But tell me, you lying spirit, when or where have we ever taught that the sacrament (though in itself always "of avail," salutary, and good) is "of avail" to everyone, unless he receives it in faith through the words of God which are in with it?

In dealing with these matters, Dr. Karlstadt employs nothing but real devilish tricks. First, he uses wonderfully beautiful words (heartily, ardently, taste, knowledge), so that one might think him in earnest. But he saw clearly that bread and wine are too ordinary in themselves, so he had to blow them up with such additions, but without showing either way or means of arriving at them. Secondly, he does not use the word, faith, to make it seem as if he were teaching of other and much higher things than we, and as if true faith was nothing compared to "ardent knowledge," though he knows as much of the acknowledgment of Christ as of faith and a good conscience. Thirdly, he strikes a treacherous blow in seeking to picture us as teaching merely a reception of the sacrament, without Word and faith, though he well knows otherwise, and lies continuously, poisonously, and wantonly. As I have said above, to employ obvious lies in these great matters is not the work of a good spirit, but of a vengeful devil, by which indeed Dr. Karlstadt is possessed.

He comes next upon the word *sacramentaliter* and says, the sacramental flesh of Christ is of no more avail than his natural flesh, for it presents neither death nor resurrection, etc. Here he boasts that with this piece he has boxed the ears of the pope so that his whole face was blackened, together with all papists, old and new. For a nobody you boast pretty loftily. I do not know whether the spirit purposely puts on such irrational and mad demeanor, or whether God plagues him so horribly. Out of his own fancy, without any basis, he makes a bare, naked, impotent, statement that the sacramental body of Christ is of "no avail," etc. By such a word the pope and all of us are supposed to be vanquished. Were it the heathen Priapus he would probably pass wind in the face of such well-aimed terror.

I have already said that it is not right, but blasphemous before God, if one says the body of Christ is of no avail, as this mad spirit raves. He is ever beneficial, wherever he is, however he may seem of no avail because of my unbelief. The sun is always shining, though unseen by the

blind man. The Word of God is ever salutary, though a poison and "a fragrance of death to death" [2 Cor. 2:16]. The body of Christ is always in the sacrament, even if not to these mad and blind spirits, who have not yet learned so much from their high, heavenly spirit as to know that flesh and the flesh of Christ are not one and the same flesh, but one is a flesh of life, the other a flesh of death. But what difference do life and death mean to such prophets? If only they had the honor of being holy spirits, that would be quite enough.

But he says that one cannot see in the sacrament the death and resurrection of Christ, therefore Christ is of no avail there. Brother, is this true? What high prophets! But tell me, how do you see the death and resurrection in the body of Christ seated at the supper table, to which the *touto* refers? Is it marked on his brow? No? Then even there he does not benefit us. How this spirit makes a fool of himself in all his words. He can say nothing but that it boomerangs on his own head and hits him so that he not only is blackened but is made to stagger as a drunkard. If now the words of Christ lead and teach us to see the death and resurrection in the seated Christ, why should they not do so also in the body and blood of the sacrament? For it is not the body of Christ, either seated at the table or present in the bread, but the word that he speaks, "This is given for you," which teaches us about the death and resurrection of Christ.

But suppose your knowledge and remembrance of Christ were this pure passion, pure heart, pure ardor, pure fire, before which also the sectarian spirits were to melt away and were to blow up their spirituality with words which are a thousand times more high-sounding, what then? What would be gained? Nothing except new monks and hypocrites who would with greater devotion and earnestness stand before the bread and wine (if everything went well), as hitherto the sensitive consciences have stood before the sacrament. Indeed as great a concern and anxiety would manifest itself about this knowledge and remembrance as hitherto has been felt for the worthy reception of the body of Christ. For the acknowledgment which they advocate accomplishes nothing. Even the devil knows full well and recognizes that the body of Christ is given for us, yet this does not help him.

The knowledge, however, does help if I do not doubt, but in true faith hold firmly that the body and blood of Christ is given for me, for me, for me (I repeat), in order to take away my sins, as the word in the sacrament affirms, "This is the body, given for you." This knowledge produces joyful, free, and assured consciences. This is the meaning in Isa. 53[:11], "By his knowledge he will make many to be accounted righteous." This teaching is as hostile as death to Dr. Karlstadt's spirit, and in his desire to eradicate it he makes a great ado about "passionate, heartfelt, earnest knowledge of the body of Christ," as if he were much in earnest, yet he really stifles it. He thinks one does not see that out of the word of Christ he makes a pure commandment and law which accomplishes nothing more than to tell and bid us to remember and acknowledge him. Furthermore, he makes this acknowledgment nothing else than a work that we do, while we receive nothing else than bread and wine. But more of this later.

I will, however, show up this spirit. With such high-sounding words he hopes to anticipate the accusation and outcry that he despoils the sacrament by making it merely bread and wine. Therefore he vaunts himself and spruces up these great words, so that one might suppose he wanted to exalt the sacrament. But basically it is the devil's intention to dash it to the ground and institute instead a festive meal, where finally it ends up in excessive eating and drinking and throwing of jugs and cans against the walls, brawling, and fighting. For if hitherto it has not been possible to maintain reverence when it has been believed that the true body of Christ was

present, what kind of reverence will remain if it is thought that only bread and wine are present? What jolly companions we then would be, revelling and carousing until the heath begins to wave.

So you can clearly see how the devil makes a commandment out of a promise of Christ and in place of faith institutes a human work, as I have said of him above. For all that Dr. Karlstadt spews out in this matter about the knowledge of the body of Christ derives from referring his *touto* to the seated body of Christ, all from his own fancy, as we have heard. For with this *touto* he means that we are asked only to practice the knowledge of Christ in this sacrament, though Christ in this place says not a word about such knowledge, commandment, or work. Nor can he show any basis, Scripture, or reason except his hopeless *touto* and his own notions, which let him believe who believes the devil. He makes also this knowledge a pure work, destroying thereby both faith and the promise of Christ.

From this you can grasp that Dr. Karlstadt's theology has not gotten beyond teaching how we are to imitate Christ, making of Christ only an example and lawgiver. From this only works can be learned. He does not know and teach Christ as our treasure and the gift of God, from which faith follows, and which is the highest of doctrines. All this he wants to dress up and obscure with these words: passionate knowledge, ardent remembrance, and the like. He descends from faith to works in a manner that I long ago observed would lead his teaching and skill to a point where he would affirm that the free will plays a part in the things of God and in good works.

Further, the mad spirit is so ignorant of Scripture that he interprets the word, "remembrance," where Christ says, "This do in remembrance of me," only in the manner of the sophists [scholastic teachers] to mean, the inner thoughts of the heart, as one would think of any one. For this spirit must be inward, and make inward and spiritual what God wants to be outward, so that nothing will be external. But it is still more mischievous and malicious, that he gives such remembrance the power to justify, as faith does. The proof he gives is, he says, that it is written, "That they have done this in remembrance of me." What think you? It is written, "They have done it in remembrance of me." Therefore such remembrance justifies. There you comprehend how well Dr. Karlstadt understands the Lord's Supper, his remembrance, and justification, namely, that the devil shows only ridicule and scorn in these matters.

You should, however, know and hold that this remembrance of Christ is an outward remembrance, as one can speak of remembering any one. This is the way the Scriptures speak of it, for example, in Psalm 15 [Ps. 16:4]: "I will not take their names upon my lips"; Psalm 10 [Ps. 9:6]: "The very memory of them is perished"; Psalm 72 [Ps. 83:4] "Let the name of Israel be remembered no more"; Psalm 111 [Ps. 112:1]: "The righteous will be remembered for ever." By the words, "This do in remembrance of me," Christ meant what Paul meant by his words, "Proclaim the death of the Lord," etc. [1 Cor. 11:26]. Christ wants us to make him known when we receive the sacrament and proclaim the gospel, so as to confirm faith. He does not want us to sit and indulge in such fancies and make out of such a remembrance a good work, as Dr. Karlstadt dreams. Would that these prophets had put in more time in study before they published books.

From this you know well that such remembrance does not justify, but that they must first be justified who would preach, proclaim, and practice the outward remembrance of Christ, as it is written in Rom. 10[:10], "For man believes with his heart and so is justified, and he confesses

with his lips and so is saved." The righteousness which Dr. Karlstadt produces out of remembrance, however, avails nothing and you should beware of it. He lies to you and deceives you. For he does not make such knowledge spiritual as it ought to be. For Isaiah [Isa. 58:11] speaks of a spirit and of a spiritual knowledge which the Holy Spirit works in us, not we ourselves. I know and am convinced beyond doubt that this is the same as, Christ is given for me. But Dr. Karlstadt makes of it a human, carnal devotion and a passionate, ardent work in the heart, though not higher than the knowledge and recognition that Christ is given for us, which the devil and the hypocrites also know. He can teach knowledge, but not the use of knowledge. He spews out much about knowledge, but does not develop or rightly apply it, but permits it to remain a mere human work. That is to make it a carnal instead of a spiritual knowledge. For his spirit will not tolerate anything less than making carnal what is spiritual.

Frau Hulda gives us a fourth example when she takes St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. 11[:24], "Take, eat, this is the body which is broken for you," and seeks to master these. God help, how the spirit pales and trembles before this thunder! Still he summons courage and says, "O you poor, ignorant man, do you mean that the body of Christ was broken as bread is broken," etc.? But hear, brother, how he here chokes and writhes in pain. Tell me (he says), has Christ broken himself in the bread? If he was not in the bread that he broke you will not be able to convince any apostle that Christ broke his body in the bread. He will finally make the claim that no bone of Christ was to be broken, therefore this breaking must be understood as his suffering, thus, "This is the body which is broken for you," equals, "Which is crucified for you." See, brother, how the spirit here walks on eggs, how he twists and turns, how he talks as if he had mush in his mouth and mumbles like a half-dead, despairing person.

No, dear little spirit, you do not thus escape me. I should have treated of this phrase above with the others, but could not because of the sloppy and confused arrangement of this book. In the first place it does not help that he understands "broken" as referring to suffering and crucifixion, for Scripture does not so speak and he cannot prove otherwise. So his interpolation and peculiar fancy mean nothing. We do find that Scripture calls the troubled soul "a broken heart and spirit" [Ps. 51:17], but not with reference to bodily suffering. Even if it did so, we can thereby not be sure that such is the meaning here, unless better evidence can be produced. Nor is it germane to the argument here that no bone of Christ is to be broken. For none of us is mad enough to say that Christ was broken in the sacrament visibly as a thief might be broken on a rack. Our proof is that Christ and the apostles have broken the body of Christ, according to the word, "This is my body, which is broken for you," and that in the breaking he was in it, unless Paul lies.

Let us take the rogue by the throat. We have already thoroughly and convincingly proved that Dr. Karlstadt's *touto* must refer to the bread, when Christ says, "Take, eat, *touto* or this is my body, which is given for you." When St. Paul also uses *touto* and says, "This is the body which is broken for you," it too must refer to the bread. So the text requires that this bread be the body which is broken. Consequently this breaking must necessarily remain in the supper and in the eating at the table, and cannot mean anything else, as I have said above, than that the body is distributed in the congregation, as one breaks bread and distributes it in the congregation. It is not necessary here to indulge in fantasy as to just how the body of Christ is broken in the bread. It is enough that it is broken, that is, distributed in all its parts and pieces completely.

So it is established that the body of Christ and the bread are one, and that where the bread is broken it means that the body of Christ is broken or distributed, so that it is divided between and received by many. For had St. Paul not wanted to say that the body of Christ was in the bread—he would not have attributed to the body of Christ the breaking (which in the usage and meaning of Scripture applied especially to the bread). Now, however, no one can disregard the fact that he joins the two together, and thus refers to the bread and calls it the broken body of Christ, so that in one breaking both bread and the body are broken, and we must confess that the body of Christ is there in the bread. Just as the bread does not lose its character or name because it is broken, but remains bread and is called so, though in pieces, so also the body of Christ remains such though divided in many places among many people.

Still another point remains. St. Paul says of the bread, "This is the body which is given for you." Brother, how can it be for us? "Broken among us" would have been better. What nimble feet this spirit has, to jump so easily over this word "for us." Brother, why? This is the reason: He has undertaken to deny that the forgiveness of sins is in the sacrament. Such an undertaking is filthy, where the word "broken for us" still stands. It cannot mean otherwise than that such breaking of bread and body takes place and is instituted that it might avail us and redeem us from sins. For Christ has placed the strength and power of his suffering in the sacrament, so that we may there lay hold on it and find it according to the word, "This is my body, which is given for you for the forgiveness of sins," as we shall hear now, right soon. Therefore, this word was to remain untouched by this spirit.

Frau Hulda's fifth attempt is directed especially toward the Luther who has taught that when a person has a conscience troubled by sin he should go to the sacrament and there obtain comfort and the forgiveness of sins. Here Peter Rültz is first of all a fine fellow and speaks boldly: "O you false prophets, you promise the kingdom of God to the people for a piece of bread. I know that you do not improve the bread by your secret breathing and whispering, why then do you say that sins can be forgiven when you have blown upon it? Why do you not just as well take a handful of barley, etc., and eat it in God's name, so that you may be free from your sins?" Here I must speak with Dr. Karlstadt himself.

My dear Dr. Karlstadt, if you could not or would not attack this point in any other way, why did you not stay at home? You have your hands full, even if there were a thousand of you, if you would win me over by Scripture and argument. Then you sally forth and attack me only with insulting words and with obvious and shameless lies. Do you mean that I am afraid of lies when you yourself know that you lie? In worldly affairs when someone dishonors another with lies, and both know that these are lies, will not, brother, the one say to him who lies, you lie as an arch rascal and disgraceful scoundrel? What shall we then say of one who shamelessly lies against his conscience in divine things? All right, who still does not believe these prophets to be full of the devil, let him listen. I will show them up with their shameless lies.

Tell me, first, spirit of lies, when have we ever taught that a piece of bread forgives sins? Ah, Peter Rültz and Victus Knebel, prove it by one single syllable or punctuation mark, since it is your custom to prove your points in this way. Since you know that we do not teach so, what kind of a spirit is it that makes you lie so scandalously? If it were because you forgot or did not know, I could regard you as human. But since you lie so maliciously, knowingly, and poisonously, no one can see in you anything else than the evil spirit. But it is the nature of these prophets to speak thus scornfully and insultingly in divine matters in order to excite the mad

mob which gets the idea through such words that here is the real victory and triumph, though they hear no real sense.

Secondly, tell me when we whisper or breathe upon the bread? Ah, now, show me! And where have we ever taught that our whispering and breathing have improved the bread? Ah, now, why don't you answer? All right, I will take an oath. If Dr. Karlstadt believes there is any God in heaven or on earth, may Christ my Lord never more be merciful and gracious to me. I know that is a serious oath. My reason for it is that Dr. Karlstadt knows that we do not breathe or whisper over the bread, but do speak the divine, almighty, heavenly, and holy words which Christ himself spoke at the supper with his holy lips and commanded us to speak. I shall remain silent concerning the evil and sinful papists. I affirm this, that if an ass, as Balaam's ass [Num. 22.28], spoke these words, or if even a devil spoke them, still they are the words of God and are to be held in all honor, as is fitting.

Tell me, if some one certainly knows that it is a Word of God and yet dares consciously to noise abroad with disdain and ridicule that it is a human whispering and breathing, thus perverting the poor mob by such lies and poison, and does this without any fear or trembling and shows no contrition for it, but rather feels joy and glee in such wickedness, as if God would give him a crown for such blasphemy and perversion of souls and dub him a knight of grace, how can such a one believe or think that there can be any God? He cannot be possessed by one devil. Let it be. Dr. Karlstadt will discover this, if he has not already done so. If God rewards him I too will say that there is no God. But in friendliness I warn Dr. Karlstadt to do penance. God has been tempted enough. It has lasted long enough. It will and must soon become otherwise. Would to God that in this respect I may be a liar and false prophet. Alas, dear Lord, what can we do if Thou dost forsake us?

Miserable spirit, why don't you lay hold of the right thing? Why don't you correct our teaching? You impute a strange teaching to us, which you impose on us deceitfully since it is not ours. What is easier than to imagine a lie and attribute it to someone, and then to fight about it and become a knight? Our teaching is that bread and wine do not avail. I will go still farther. Christ on the cross and all his suffering and his death do not avail, even if, as you teach, they are "acknowledged and meditated upon" with the utmost "passion, ardor, heartfeltness." Something else must always be there. What is it? The Word, the Word, the Word. Listen, lying spirit, the Word avails. Even if Christ were given for us and crucified a thousand times, it would all be in vain if the Word of God were absent and were not distributed and given to me with the bidding, this is for you, take what is yours.

Even if I followed the Karlstadtian teaching and preached the remembrance and knowledge of Christ with such passion and seriousness that I sweated blood and became feverish, it would be of no avail and all in vain. For it would be pure work and commandment, but no gift or Word of God offered and given to me in the body and blood of Christ. It would be as if I had a chest full of gold and great treasure buried or preserved in a certain place. I might think myself to death and experience all desire, great passion, and ardor in such knowledge and remembrance of the treasure until I became ill. But what benefit would all this be to me if this treasure were not opened, given, and brought to me and placed in my keeping? It would mean truly to love, but not to enjoy. It would mean to be satisfied with the scent and to become drunk from the sight of the glass, as Isaiah [Isa. 29:8] says: One dreams that he eats and drinks, but when he awakes, his soul is faint, etc.

The entire teaching of Dr. Karlstadt is a fantasy of this kind. For by his high-sounding words, "passionate remembrance, ardent knowledge, experiential taste of the suffering of Christ," he mocks us and does not bring us any farther than showing the health-giving treasure in a glass or vessel. We may look and smell until we are satisfied, but as in a dream. He gives nothing, opens nothing, lets us have nothing. Indeed by such high-sounding words he seeks to obscure the word that gives us such a treasure, namely, "Take, eat, this is the body given for you." To him the words, "for you," are poison and bitter death. But they are our comfort and life. For they open the treasure to us and allow us to appropriate it.

So that our readers may the better perceive our teaching I shall clearly and broadly describe it. We treat of the forgiveness of sins in two ways. First, how it is achieved and won. Second, how it is distributed and given to us. Christ has achieved it on the cross, it is true. But he has not distributed or given it on the cross. He has not won it in the supper or sacrament. There he has distributed and given it through the Word, as also in the gospel, where it is preached. He has won it once for all on the cross. But the distribution takes place continuously, before and after, from the beginning to the end of the world. For inasmuch as he had determined once to achieve it, it made no difference to him whether he distributed it before or after, through his Word, as can easily be proved from Scripture. But now there is neither need nor time to do so.

If now I seek the forgiveness of sins, I do not run to the cross, for I will not find it given there. Nor must I hold to the suffering of Christ, as Dr. Karlstadt trifles, in knowledge or remembrance, for I will not find it there either. But I will find in the sacrament or gospel the word which distributes, presents, offers, and gives to me that forgiveness which was won on the cross. Therefore, Luther has rightly taught that whoever has a bad conscience from his sins should go to the sacrament and obtain comfort, not because of the bread and wine, not because of the body and blood of Christ, but because of the word which in the sacrament offers, presents, and gives the body and blood of Christ, given and shed for me. Is that not clear enough?

Yet this mad spirit has attacked us and said, O you false prophets, you have no word in the sacrament which presents or gives you the forgiveness of sins. I repeat, he should have attacked the word in the sacrament on which we stand, defiantly and persistently, and should have proved that we do not have it there. Then he would have been a valiant knight. Even if only bread and wine were there present, as they claim, as long as the word, "Take, eat, this is my body given for you," etc., is there, the forgiveness of sins, on account of this word, would be in the sacrament. Just as in the case of baptism we confess that only water is present, but since the Word of God, which forgives sin, is connected with it, we readily say with St. Paul, that baptism is a bath of regeneration and renewal. Everything depends on the Word.

There you have, my reader, Dr. Karlstadt's devil and can see how he has proposed to destroy the external Word of God, which also he does not regard or consider or designate as anything more than a whisper, breath, or blowing. Also, you can see how he has wanted to abolish the sacrament altogether, both bodily and spiritually, denying the bodily presence of the body and blood of Christ and the spiritual presence of the forgiveness of sins, so that neither the sacrament nor its fruits remain. And in place of a divine ordinance and word he has wanted to institute his own fancied remembrance and knowledge. But he lacked the necessary skill. Now you know how to judge him.

I must add that at the very end of his book he spews out great wisdom and cleverness. He says, the mortal body of Christ was at the supper, but now he is immortal and cannot be given for us, according to the words, "This is the body which is given for you." So now he neither is nor can be given for us, and the words are now in the past and must be false, since we now speak of the immortal body. So it must also be false to say that the mortal body is in the bread and wine, as we hold such suppers even after the death of Christ. Now he is immortal and is not given in the sense Christ held when he was mortal. How say you? How Frau Hulda seeks for loopholes and escape!

To this we answer. First, the blood of Christ does not become the blood of Gabriel or Michael when it becomes immortal, but remains the blood of the same Christ. For we believe and hold that the blood of Christ now at the right hand of God in heaven was shed for us once only. If we consider the act by which the forgiveness of sins was achieved, we know that it did not take place at the supper. But now it has taken place and is accomplished. When we consider the application of the forgiveness, we are not dealing with a particular time, but find that it has taken place from the beginning of the world. So St. John in the Book of Revelation [13:8] says that the Lamb of God was slain before the foundation of the world.

Since now all they who are forgiven still have sins, the body and blood of Christ are necessary for them. Thus it is still true that he is given for them. For while the act has taken place, as long as I have not appropriated it, it is as if it had not taken place for me. Frau Hulda gets nowhere with her sharp sophistry, for she does not see that the question concerns completely the application of what Christ has won for the sake of the distribution and has placed in the distribution. As we have mentioned above, St. Paul therefore says, "The body of Christ was broken for us" [1 Cor. 11:24]. It neither hinders nor helps the forgiveness to speak of mortal or immortal, or of what has happened or will happen. It is sufficient that the blood be one and the same. When it is given for and to me, it is shed for me. That which is shed for me, does and must take place daily.

This is the best and finest illustration of Frau Hulda's ability in these matters, showing us how she acts and speaks as a bride of the devil, expressing what he inspires. Dr. Karlstadt further juggles and says that Christ does not descend from heaven, since Paul says, "We are to proclaim his death until he comes" 1 Cor 11[:26]. Again he ridicules the Word of God asking if Christ must leap up on account of the stinking breath of a drunken priest, and if we can call or conjure him down from heaven? Also he objects that Christ would have to leave the place where he sat in order to creep into the bread, and would have to leave heaven, were he to come into the bread, etc. All blasphemous words of this kind are nothing but childish, mad, sacrilegious ideas, and lies which are not worthy of answer.

For we do not say that he comes from heaven or leaves his place vacant. Otherwise this spirit would have to say that the Son of God, when he became man in the womb of his mother, also had to leave heaven. All the ridicule that Karlstadt heaps on the sacrament, he has to direct also to the deity of Christ in the flesh, as he also surely will do in time. When St. Stephen saw Jesus, Acts 8 [7:55], he did not say that he came down from heaven, but he saw him standing at the right hand of God. When Paul, in Acts 9[:4], heard him speak, Christ did not come down from heaven. In short, the mad spirit thinks in childish terms, as if Christ went up and down. He does not understand the realm of Christ which is in every place, and as Paul says, fills all in all (Eph. 1[:23]). We are not bidden to search out how it can be that our bread becomes and is the

body of Christ. It is the Word of God that says so. We hold to that and believe it. Chew on it, you poor devil, and search for as long a time as you need to discover how it occurs.

He also ridicules us, claiming that we say and teach that the cup is in the blood, and jests that we see no blood there. Always he turns his ears away from the Word of God and sees with single vision the bread and wine. For this spirit will not believe what the Word of God says, but only what he sees and feels. What a fine faith. Our answer to this wicked devil is this: This word in Luke 22[:20], "This cup is the new testament in my blood," does not and cannot mean that the word, "in my blood," should belong to the word "this cup," as this spirit in his great and pure malice pretends, but to the word "a new testament," as also these words naturally follow each other in text and meaning. This is to say, "This cup is a new testament, not in itself, for it is perhaps glass or silver, but because my blood is therein, it is a new testament because of this blood." For whoever so receives the cup as to receive the blood of Christ which is shed for us, he receives the new testament, that is, the forgiveness of sins and eternal life.

But I will tell you why Dr. Karlstadt must blaspheme, juggle, and ridicule at this point. The text is too clear and too powerful and he is at a loss to know what to say. For this word more forcibly and powerfully than any before requires that the blood is in the sacrament. So he hopes to fill the ears of the mob with other pranks, so as to divert attention from these words of Luke. I think I find evidence here that it is against his own conscience that Dr. Karlstadt denies that the blood and body of Christ is in the sacrament, and that in his heart he is hostile to God and wants to blaspheme and dishonor him, to the injury and vexation of his Word and sacrament. I believe, I say once more, that Dr. Karlstadt has surrendered himself and dared to become an avowed enemy of God, wanting to race rather than trot to hell. God grant that I be mistaken and lie.

For this word of Luke and Paul is clearer than sunlight and more overpowering than thunder. First, no one can deny that he speaks of the cup, since he says, "This is the cup." Secondly, he calls it the cup of the new testament. This is overwhelming, for it could not be a new testament by means and on account of wine alone. For what else is the new testament than forgiveness of sins and eternal life won for us by Christ and allotted to us in the sacrament? If now the cup is to be a new testament, there must be something in and connected with it as effectual as the new testament. Is it not the blood of Christ, as he says, "in my blood"? If not, tell us what it is. So we can well say to these spirits, O you false prophets who give and promise the new testament to the people for and in a drink of wine. Then the text should read, this is the cup of the new testament in wine. But now the words read: This is the cup of the New Testament in my blood. Thereby Dr. Karlstadt's skill, writings, books, both those he has written and can yet still write, are thrust to the ground and so overwhelmed that he can in no way resist. Were he able he would be still more malicious.

There our text stands. However you bite, chew, ridicule, confidently blaspheme, or wickedly act, dear heavenly prophets, the cup you must let remain as the new testament, even though there be no *touto* here referring to it. And even if all *toutos* were on your side, you still would have to admit that it is the new testament not because of or in its nature but through and in the blood of Christ. The blood, the blood of Christ makes this cup to be a new testament. It cannot be understood as the blood of the Christ who sits there, for the cup cannot be the new testament on account of a blood that is not in it, or does not touch or concern it. Cup and blood must here be one, as we have said above, so that whoever has or takes the cup also has and

takes the blood. Whither now, dear factious spirits? I will let you write and shriek for a thousand years and need not oppose you with more than one word, “This is the cup of the new testament.” O how the words, “new testament,” smash the prophets and spirits into one lump in the gutter.

I have also heard said (for I have not seen or read all these poisonous books) how they seek help from what Christ, in Matt. 16[:18] says to Peter, “You are Peter and on this rock I will build my church.” Here they say is a parallel. Christ begins to speak of Peter, whom he calls a rock, and then immediately turns the thoughts to another rock and says, “On this rock I will build my church.” So also here, when he says, “Take, eat, this is my body,” and then turns from speaking about bread to speaking about his seated body. See, what a perfect match. Clutch at any straw. One lie must be accompanied by seven other lies in order to make it look like and seem to be the truth.

To this we reply. Even if it seemed that Christ spoke in the manner of Matthew 16, that it must be so here would still not be enough for us to base an article of faith and establish conscience on it. It would have to be proved by clear text that it is and must be so read in this place. It means nothing if these spirits say that Christ in Matt. 16[:18] turns the meaning from one rock to another, therefore here also the thought turns from bread to the body. Who will guarantee and assure us that it must be so here? You of course say so, but how can one believe you when you have no proof? You have to prove the parallel with Scripture and not simply assert it of yourself. For faith (as I have often said), does not want some one simply to say or sing thus, but wants a word of God that plainly says: So it is and not otherwise. For faith wants to be no reed that the wind shakes [Matt. 11:7].

Furthermore, it is not true that Matthew 16 reads similarly. For the word “and” stands between the two and the word “rock” is repeated, thus, “You are Peter, and on this rock,” etc. So the phrase, “You are Peter,” is one complete sentence, and then a new thought begins, namely, “On this rock,” etc. Such an “and” and a repetition of the word, “body,” do not occur in the Supper, but the words follow immediately. “Take, eat, this is my body.” If Matthew 16 had read thus, “You are Peter or rock, on it or on which I will build my church,” then it would be similar in structure. Or if in the account of the Supper, we were to read, “Take, eat the body and this is my body,” it would be like Matthew 16.

Now, however, there is an “and” in Matthew 16 and in our passage no “and” is inserted, and Christ repeats the word, “rock,” in Matthew 16 and says, “On this rock,” but in the supper does not repeat the word, “body.” This shows that he used the word, “rock,” about himself or the word which Peter spoke, and the word, “body,” about the bread. So these two sentences are as alike as water and fire. Also the Evangelist in Matthew 16 carefully distinguished and pointed out the second part as a new phrase concerning the rock. For he refers to Peter as *der* [masculine] but to the second rock as *die* [feminine] to make clear that Peter, *der*, was not the other rock, which he makes *die*, on which Christ would build his church. He puts *der* and *die* in two distinct parts, while in the account of the supper he uses the pronoun *das* for both the bread and the body in one sentence when he says, “This [*das*] is my body.”

Finally in order not to speak entirely without scriptural basis, he does (God be praised) produce one verse, probably in parting. It is from Matt. 24[:23]: “If any one says to you, ‘Lo, here is the Christ,’ or ‘There he is!’ do not believe it.” When we say Christ is in the bread it is supposed to be the same as saying, here and there Christ is, therefore it is not truly so. Here,

here, they think they've hit upon something. All right, I will sing "Eli" to the prophets and proclaim a recess. So blind does hate make these spirits, that they do not look around to see what comes before or after these words, but fall for what seems to be the meaning on first sight. So again we have to make it clear to them.

There is quite a difference between speaking of Christ and of the body and blood of Christ. For when the Evangelist says, "Here or there Christ is," and the like, he speaks of the whole Christ, that is, of the kingdom of Christ. This is the meaning which the text in Luke 17[:20] strongly requires, when it says, "The kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed; nor will they say, 'Lo here it is!' or 'There!' " This the other Evangelists express thus: Christ is here or there. All of this means that the kingdom of God does not consist in external things, places, times, persons, works, but as he himself says, "The kingdom of God is within you." From this it follows not that Christ is nowhere, but that he is everywhere and fills all things (Ephes. 1[:23]). He is bound to no particular place, so that he must be there and nowhere else, as they make out who do not let our consciences be free but bind them to a particular place, work, or person.

Now, as Christ himself and his kingdom are not bound to any one place or external thing, so all that belongs to his kingdom is free and bound to nothing—the gospel, baptism, the sacrament, and Christians. For the gospel is and must be free in regard to all places and is bound to no particular spot. For it is not at Rome alone or here or there to the exclusion of some other place. So also baptism and the sacrament. For it is not necessary that in the churches alone and nowhere else there be preaching, baptism, and the sacrament. They can be in any place where there is need. It does not follow now that Christ in the sacrament is as if bound to one place, here or there. He and his sacrament are or may be free to be in any place. Consequently, these prophets wrongly apply words about the kingdom of Christ to the sacrament.

Were what they say true, then one would also have to deny that gospel, baptism, and sacrament are nowhere. For Christ is present in the gospel and yet must be, orally and bodily, in places and localities. And Christ could not be in heaven at the right hand of the Father, since here too we might say, "See, there Christ is." And of St. Stephen, when he saw Christ stand (Acts 8 [7:56]), we might say, "Thou liest, for Christ is neither here nor there," if the carnal thoughts of these prophets were worth anything. Indeed their own teaching about the knowledge and remembrance of Christ could not stand, for these imply that he is at one place.

This phrase, "here nor there" must be understood, first of all as referring to bodily, external places and things, and second, as referring to such bodily places as are particularly prescribed by false prophets for others as necessary for salvation, instead of permitting freedom in regard to such things, as we have discussed in regard to the papacy. We teach not that the body and blood of Christ are visibly present in external things, but that they are hidden in the sacrament. Nor do we say that he is and must be in particular places and is not free to be in all. Rather we claim that he and the bread and wine are and must be free in regard to all localities, places, times, and persons.

The reason for saying, "This is my body," and not, "This is Christ," is that we might not regard the whole Christ, that is, his kingdom, as in the sacrament, but see in it clearly and particularly the true and real body, as a part of his kingdom and of the whole Christ. In the same manner we do not call the gospel Christ or the kingdom of Christ, but speak of it as an

oral, bodily preaching, regarding it as a part of the whole Christ or his kingdom. It has the character of the whole Christ in that it is not necessarily bound to any particular locality but is free as to all places. Therefore when we speak of Christ, it is of the whole, but when we speak of the body, it is as of a part of the whole.

Herewith I will be content for this time. To Dr. Karlstadt's contention as to our authority to bring the body and blood of Christ into the sacrament we have given sufficient proof, and he will have to let us keep our belief that the bread that "we" break is the body of Christ. This "we" has truly its authority from the words of Christ himself at his supper. What he imagines concerning the righteousness of mortification, and its coming before the inner righteousness of the spirit, is his own fancy and is without any foundation. For above you have heard of the right order: At the beginning and first of all is the faith in the heart, the righteousness of the spirit, then follows the mortification and death of the old nature (Rom. 8[:13]), "For if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body you will live." By the Spirit, he says, which thus must be there.

This is my answer to all the books of Dr. Karlstadt on the sacrament which he has written and contrived over the past three years. I have answered him in three weeks, and will give him another three years, and three more, or six in all, to make a decent reply to me. I warn them once more to see to it that they meet the issue, for they need it. For my part I courteously give them thanks from my whole heart and ask for none in return, because they have so greatly confirmed me in regard to this article of faith. For now I see that it is not possible to produce anything in opposition to this article. I have gone to such lengths and written so much in order to show clearly how obscurely and disorderly Dr. Karlstadt writes. I hope that from this book Dr. Karlstadt first of all may better understand himself. For I do not doubt that up to now he has not himself understood what he has been doing or whither his teaching may lead. He cannot rightly grasp or understand anything, much less develop his ideas or write.

In closing, I want to warn everyone truly and fraternally to beware of Dr. Karlstadt and his prophets, for two reasons. First, because they run about and teach, without a call. This God condemns through Jeremiah [23:21], who says, "I did not send them, yet they ran. I did not speak to them, yet they prophesied." For this reason they are judged by Christ (John 10[:1]), as thieves and murderers who do not enter by the door, but climb in by another way. They boast of possessing the Spirit, more than the apostles, and yet for more than three years now have secretly prowled about and flung around their dung. Were he a true spirit he would at once have come forward and given proof of his call by signs and words. But he is a treacherous, secret devil who sneaks around in corners until he has done his damage and spread his poison.

The second reason is that these prophets avoid, run away from, and are silent about the main points of Christian doctrine. For in no place do they teach how we are to become free from our sins, obtain a good conscience, and win a peaceful and joyful heart before God. This is what really counts. This is a true sign that their spirit is of the devil, who can use unusual new words to excite, terrify, and mislead consciences. But their spirit cannot give quietness or peace, but goes on and teaches special works in which they are to exercise and discipline themselves. They have no idea how a good conscience can be gained or ought to be constituted. For they have not felt or ever recognized it. How can they know or feel it, when they come and teach of themselves, without a call. No good can come in this way.

The grace of God be with us all. Amen.[1]

[1] Martin Luther, *Luther's Works, Vol. 40: Church and Ministry II*, ed. Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, Hilton C. Oswald, and Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1999), 73–223.